

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_150331

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OSMANJA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No. 230/B74C ✓

Accession No. 16487 ✓

Author Bose, B.C. ✓

Title Christianity, a critical study

This book should be returned on or before the date last marked below

29 NOV 1961

14 DEC 1961

08 DEC 1961

~~2 JAN 1962~~

~~8 SEP 1965~~

~~11 OCT 1967~~

25 JUL 1984

2381

CHRISTIANITY

A CRITICAL STUDY.

BY

BASANTA COOMAR BOSE, M.A., B.L.

**Advocate, High Court, Calcutta, Author of
Conquest of Bengal and Hindu
Customs in Bengal.**

PUBLISHED BY

CHUCKERBERTY, CHATTERJEE & CO. L^{TD}.

15, College Square, Calcutta.

1929.

PUBLISHED BY—
CHUCKERBERRY, CHATTERJEE & Co. Ld.
Calcutta.

16487
220
1374C
500
Checked-2003

Checked 1963

By the same Author.

1. Conquest of Bengal, which proves that
Bengal was never conquered by the
East India Company.

Price Eight annas.

CHECKED 1956

2. Hindu Customs in Bengal.

Price One Rupee.

Checked 1975

Checked 1969

Checked 1966

R 17. No 00023096

PRINTED BY B. N. Sircar,
At the Ananda Mohan Press,
44, Chaulpati Road,
Bhowanipur,
CALCUTTA.

P R E F A C E.

THIS BOOK is a critical essay on Christianity, written by one who is not a Christian, nor brought up as a Christian, but who has the greatest admiration for the sayings of Christ. I have tried to be strictly impartial. I have therefore praised Jesus where praise is due, and found fault with him where I have not been able to agree with him, such as his doctrine of eternal punishment, and salvation only through him. I have disbelieved the miracles, and tried to explain most of them away. I have also disbelieved his resurrection, and tried to show how far Christianity has civilized mankind. If my words give offence to the religious feelings of any person, I beg his pardon, for I regard Jesus as a superman, though not God.

I should mention my obligations to the authors of the Universal Bible Dictionary and to a luminous article on Christianity and Buddhism by Swami Abhedananda.

I am obliged to my nephew Mr. Bepin Chunder Basu Advocate for having seen the book through the press.

CALCUTTA

1929.

}

BASANTA COOMAR BOSE.

• INTRODUCTION.

The subject of this work is Christianity. Many persons have written works on the subject and it might look presumptuous on my part to venture to write anything on the subject. However, it appears that almost all the writers on this subject are Christians who can see nothing wrong in it. Before Baur founded the Tübingen School, there was practically no critical author on the subject, and even the writers of the last century have not dared to thoroughly criticise the Christian religion. They were all brought up as Christians and though some of them revolted against it they had not the courage to criticise some of Christ's sayings, such for instance, as his second advent, which was to have happened in the lifetime of Christ's generation, and which raised great hopes of immediate salvation and thus caused the spread of the Christian religion, but which event has not yet happened nor is expected to happen within millions of years. Farrar, in his *Life of Christ*, starts with saying that he has written his book as a devout Christian and what sort of criticism can be expected from him? His bias towards Christianity prevented him from finding any fault with Christ. Ernest Renan has written a panegyric of Christ, such as any devout Christian could have written, though he was not a believer in Christianity. He merely points out which portions of the gospel narrative are not historical, but he rarely criticises Christ's sayings, and though he does not believe in the resurrection, he does not come to the conclusion that this event, which is, according to Paul, the basis of Christianity, by which I mean the godhead of Christ, being an untrue

fact, Christianity cannot be a true religion. Strauss is more critical than either of the above, but his conclusions are halting. He does not come to the conclusion that Christ is not God, nor a person of the Divinity. These books are not critical works on Christianity, but they merely narrate the events of Christ's life. I was born in a Hindu family though I am not a follower of Hinduism, and so I have no religious bias which is the strongest kind of bias enumerated by Herbert Spencer. I care only to seek truth, as I have no bias for or against any religion. Further, people in Christian countries are afraid to offend the religious susceptibilities of their community. They will be socially boycotted. But here in India the Hindus are at liberty to express any opinions they like on the subject of religion. No Hindu has yet hanged or burnt or otherwise put to death any man for his religious views. This is the grandest achievement of the Hindu religion. In fact no Hindu or Buddhist or the follower of any other religion of Indian origin has ever put to death or tortured any one of a different faith for his religious views.

Among Hindus, Charbaka wrote a treatise in favour of Atheism and he was not punished, but Socrates and Jesus had to suffer death for their religious views and Athens was the most enlightened city of antiquity, and it was then at the height of its intellectual eminence, and we find Aristophanes, the greatest comedian of Athens, writing his *Clouds* expressly to abuse Socrates by name, though Socrates was one of the greatest men Attica has ever produced, and Strauss in his *life of Christ* (p. 29) places him almost on a par with the Founder of Christianity.

To the Christians my only request is to judge of

this book with an unbiassed mind. If I have tried to shew that Jesus was not God, I have at the same time praised him highly, and I believe that he and Buddha were the greatest teachers of religion which the world has yet produced. My principal objections to Christianity are Christ's theory of eternal damnation, and his godhead, though he himself nowhere claims to be God, and it is Paul and others who have defied him.

Christianity is principally based upon the New Testament though there have been many subsequent writings. Now the principal books of that Testament are the four Gospels. Matthew's gospel is in Greek, but his original gospel, called Logia, was in Hebrew. Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, who lived a century after the death of Jesus, mentions only two gospels, one by Mark, written briefly, incomplete, and not chronologically arranged, and this Logia of Matthew in Hebrew. The Greek gospel of Matthew, and the gospels of Luke and John he does not mention and he says he prefers oral tradition to the books. Matthew was one of the twelve apostles of Christ, but his original work being lost, we can form no idea of it nor judge of its contents. The present gospel is not called his gospel, but the gospel "according to" Matthew? (Renan, *Life of Jesus*, Introduction p. 8).

Mark was not an apostle, but was a friend or disciple of Peter who, after his miraculous escape from prison went to his mother's house, 12 Acts 12. He was Paul's companion (4 Col. 10). It is said that Mark got his materials from Peter, and Justin Martyr (100-120 A. D.) quotes the gospel at the "Memoirs of Peter," though this Peter, the foremost of the apostles, and on whom Jesus built his church and to whom he gave the keys of the kingdom of

heaven (16 Mat. 15-19) and from whom all the Popes claim apostolic succession, and assume the proud title of Vicar of God, never attempted to write any gospel, and his whole literature regarding Christ consists of two epistles, which do not even mention that he met the resurrected Christ; though he mentions the resurrection of Christ 1 (1 Pet.) 3, and there is nothing in them which is ennobling. I shall come to these epistles in the body of this work. However, Mark admittedly wrote from hearsay. Renan, *Life of Jesus*, Introduction pp. 8-9.

Mark's narrative is very short and states nothing about the birth or genealogy of Christ and starts with his baptism. The last 12 verses of his last chapter, 16 Mark 9-20 have been rejected by the authors of the Revised Version. These relate to Christ's appearance before his apostles and his declaration that the believers will be saved, but "he that believeth not shall be damned." "The two oldest Greek manuscripts and some other authorities omit from V. 9 to end." *Universal Bible Dictionary*. Mark wrote after the death of Peter and that of Paul in 67 A. D.

Luke starts by saying that he heard from "eye witnesses and ministers of the word." 1 L.2. He was a Gentile, 4 Col. 11, and a companion of Paul in his travels, who calls him "the beloved physician." 4 Col. 14. This Luke was also the author of the Acts of the Apostles, (1 A.1,) which mentions his previous work and is addressed to the same person, called Theophilus, which may be a common name, meaning lover of God. Renan says that the 21st chapter of Luke inseparable from the rest of the work, was written after the siege of Jerusalem. *Life of Jesus* Introduction p. 7.

The last gospel goes by the name of John. So long Christians believed that this John was the beloved disciple of Jesus, and the son of Zebedee. But modern criticism ascribes the book to a devout Christian of philosophic character, who wrote in the second century A. D. John's most intimate disciple, Polycarp, often quotes from the three synoptic gospels, but does not mention his gospel. Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, probably one of his auditors as Irenaeus thinks, omits all mention of this gospel. Eusebius also does not mention it, and Justin mentions John's Apocalypse, but not this gospel. Marcian (about 140) did not know this gospel. John had a brother James, but his name is not mentioned at all in this gospel. John, a Galilean fisherman, could not have written in Greek and put in his work abstract matters of philosophy culled from the Neo Platonic philosophy of Alexandria, with which the gospel starts. On these grounds Renan (p. 11-13) rejects the fourth gospel as not authentic. Now this gospel does not, like Mark's, mention the Sermon on the Mount, the greatest of the sayings of Christ, and Jesus' prophetic discourse after his resurrection, nor his ascension. John mentions only one parable 15 J.1-8, while the synoptics mention thirty three others. Out of thirty five miracles John mentions eight, of which six are narrated by him only. Thus two thirds of the book are entirely new, and "it is from this gospel that the most numerous decisive proofs of our Lord's Deity are arrived." Universal Bible Dictionary, art. John. I wish to add that it is this gospel which makes Jesus most glorify himself. He is once made to say "I and my Father are one" 10 J. 30. Remove these sayings as spurious and much of Christ's divinity will fade. This gospel was referred

CHRISTIANITY.

to, perhaps for the first time, in a dispute at Laodicea in A. D. 170. Renan p. 13.

Then come the Acts and the Epistles. The Acts were written as already stated, by Luke. They state what events happened after Christ's death and resurrection.

The Epistles of Paul occupy much larger space than any two of the gospels, and are often excellent reading, almost rivalling the sayings of Christ. Vide his sermon in 12 to 15 Rom. His sermons are more practical, whereas the Sermon on the Mount is idealistic and partly impractical.

It is Paul who preached Christianity in the heathen countries. The apostles had quarrelled as to whether Christians should be circumcised and it was afterwards settled in the First Council that they need not be circumcised, and Peter, James, and Paul, were in that Council, 12 A. 12-13 and Barnabas, Paul, and others were sent to the Gentiles for their conversion. 12.A.22. Paul travelled through various countries and baptised many heathens and is therefore called the apostle of the Gentiles, though he was at first a Jew and a Pharisee and assisted in putting to death many Christians as he himself admits. 22 A. 4 and 26 A. 10. Paul was sent to Rome as a prisoner, but was acquitted by the emperor. It is said that he was put to death by Nero. in 67 A.D.

After Paul's epistles comes the epistle of James, one of the apostles. It is a very short one consisting of five chapters, and his principal doctrine was "faith without works is dead." 2 James 20, whereas Paul's doctrine was salvation by faith alone. He says "ye fulfil the royal law according to the scripture. Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" 2 James 8.

I have already mentioned the two short epistles of Peter, the chief of the apostles, and I therefore pass to the three epistles of John and his Revelation. The authenticity of the second and third epistles has been doubted, as they purport to have been written by John the elder.

His Revelation narrates a vision he saw, and states what Jesus revealed to him. This book is allegorical and any one can interpret it as he likes. It may be a prophetic history of the Christian church. In 16 Rev. 16 he says there will be a great fight at Armageddon, which some interpret to mean a spiritual fight, while others say it is a real fight and some suppose that the late World War was that fight. John says that the Devil was bound in the bottomless pit for a thousand years, 20 Rev. 2-3, and he will be loosed after this period expires v. 7. He speaks of a book of life v. 12, 15, 21 Rev. 27 and every man will be judged according to his works. In chapter twenty-one he says he saw a heavenly Jerusalem, which he graphically describes. In chapter twenty two he speaks of the pure river of water of life, and ends by cursing anybody who will add to or subtract from the book of Revelation.

Baur was the founder of the modern Tubingen School. He practically started the critical study of the gospels. He divides Christianity into Peterine and Pauline Christianity, that is between Jewish and Gentile Christianity. He said that the only genuine epistles of St. Paul were his two epistles to the Corinthians and his epistles to the Galatians and to the Romans, the others being doubtfully genuine. These last epistles bear traces of a later Gnosticism, and he totally rejected the apostolic character of the Pastoral Epistles.

These letters and the Acts of the Apostles were composed in the second century A. D. proceeding not from the Pauline school, but from the Catholic and Conciliatory School which towards the middle and end of the second century, sought to harmonise the schools of Peter and of Paul.

As regards the gospels, he was of opinion that they owe their origin to the same tendencies or traces of party design which he everywhere discovered in the first Christian age. The gospels he thought were not the most ancient documents of the kind. Previously there was tradition known by various names, such as the gospel of the Hebrews, of St. Peter, of the Ebionites, of the Egyptians etc. The present gospel of Matthew resembles the earlier narrations most closely, reproducing primitive Jewish Christianity with important later modifications. Luke's gospel is of Pauline origin retouched by the Conciliatory School of the second century. Mark's gospel is of later date, and of all the gospels it is the most suspected. The gospel of John was written in the second century. Baur gives cogent reasons for this and says the Revelation and this gospel could not have been the writings of the same person. Modern scholars agree with him that the synoptic gospels took their present form by degrees, being fashioned by past apostolic influences adapted to special wants in the early church. They are the deposits of Christian oral tradition, handed down for a long time before being committed to writing in its present form. This is the view also of the German and English scholars. If Baur's conclusions be correct then all the gospels, the Revelation and all the epistles except four of Paul are apocryphal. Then what remains of Christianity?

Cardinal Newman in his *Development of Christian Doctrine* p. 24 says that the gospel of St. James is contained in the old Syriac version in the second century, but origin, in the third century, is the first writer who mentions it among the Greeks, and it is not quoted by name by any Latin till the fourth.

"The epistle to the Hebrews though received in the East was not received in the Latin church till St. Jerome's time." Irenaeus is silent about the authorship. Tertullian ascribes it to St. Barnebas. Caius excludes it from his list. St. Hippolytus does not receive him. St. Cyprian is silent. St. Optatus' opinion is doubtful. (*Tracts for the Times* No. 85 p. 78 Discuss III, 6 p. 207).

St. Jerome tells us, that in his day, towards A.D.400, the Greek Church rejected the Apocalypse, but the Latin received it. The New Testament consists of twenty-seven books in all, though of varying importance. Of these, fourteen are not mentioned at all till from eighty to one hundred years after St. John's death, in which number are the Acts, the Second to the Corinthians, the Galatians, the Colossians, the Two to the Thessalonians, and St. James. Of the other thirteen, five, viz. St. John's Gospel, the Philipians, the First to Timothy, the Hebrew, and the First of St. John are quoted but by one writer during the same period." (Newman p. 125).

Cardinal Newman p. 126 says that the doctrine of the Original Sin developed by degrees and was not completed till the time of Augustine and Pelagius. I do not find any mention of the Original Sin in the four gospels, and St. Paul is the apostle who started this doctrine, 5 Rom. 12.

In the preceeding paragraphs I have given a very

short history of the several books and other writings which form the basis of Christianity. I shall in the next pages state the principal events in the life of Christ, his principal sayings, his prophecies about the destruction of the world, and the proceedings to be held on the last day when man will be judged, his arrest, trial, execution, and resurrection. I shall discuss principally the claim of Jesus to divinity. I shall not omit any of his sayings worth reproducing but I shall at the same time examine critically whether his sayings and doings and his resurrection entitle him to the position of God. His sayings are wonderfully good but the question is whether they make him a God. I shall examine this question with an open mind. I have no grudge against Christ, and I have always admired him, but I am not willing to admit his divinity.

The history of the Christian church is not properly relevant to this enquiry, but as Christians allege that the rapid spread of their religion, and the advance of civilization in Christian countries, and other matters afford very good evidence in favour of the divine origin of Christianity, I shall at the end say something on the subject.

In Appendix I I have given a very short synopsis of the Pentateuch. In Appendix II I have given a synopsis of the sayings of Christ and the other matters in the New Testament. In fact everything of importance in this Testament will be found there.

Every careful reader of the gospels will be able to see that the three synoptic gospels use the same words in narrating an event, the sequence and collocation of the sentences, and words are the same, and sometimes an almost disconnected matter is introduced in

the narrative in identical terms and the previous and subsequent paragraphs are the same and the words used are the same. For instance the parable of the fig tree is introduced in identical terms just after the statement about the darkening of the sun and moon and just before the statement about 'this generation' not passing away before the end of the world comes. The translators of the Bible have used the words 'his' and 'near' in Matthew and 'her' and 'nigh' in Mark. I hope there is nothing wrong in using separate words for the same idea. The parable of the fig tree is to be found in 24 Mat. 32-33, 13 Mk. 28-29, and 21 L. 29-31. All those things conclusively prove that the three gospels were copied from one original book. As to the identity of expressions and even words in the synoptic gospels I would refer the reader to Appendix III in which I have selected some out of the several chapters of the three synoptic gospels which agree with one another, and even the wording in the three gospels is the same.

I have gone fully into the question of the authenticity of the gospels, and some of the other books of the New Testament. Modern criticism has materially shaken the foundations of the books on which Christianity rests. However, I have assumed for my purpose, the genuineness of the whole of the New Testament, as it is no good in telling a Christian that his religion is based on apocryphal books. He will not go into this question and go on believing. I have shown from the gospels themselves that some of the prophecies of Christ have never taken place and will not take place within millions of years. I have also tried to show where Jesus got his ideas from. I have tried my best to avoid wounding the feelings of

Christians and the followers of other religions, and if I have found fault with Christians or 'Mahomedans in any respect, I must declare here that my observations exclude the Christians or Moslems living in India as the law is in a somewhat dangerous state regarding open expressions of opinion.

CHAPTER 1.

CHRIST'S BIRTH.

Christianity literally means the religion of Christ, but the Christianity which was preached by the Apostles and the immediate followers of Christ, particularly by St. Paul, is very different from the Christianity of Christ. No where does he declare himself as God or an equal partner of God but they have deified Him and made belief in Him the only way to salvation, the other alternative being eternal damnation. In one place he says "I and the Father are one" 10.J.30, but when the audience rose to stone him for uttering this blasphemy, he said he meant to say that he was the son of God. 10 J. 36.

It is therefore necessary to examine the claim put forward by his apostles and disciples that Christ was God. Unfortunately he never defined his position. He no where says that he was God, nor does he, like Confucius or Mahomed, declare himself to be a mere man and only a prophet. He simply called himself the Son of man which may mean anything. This claim to godhead is based and can be based solely on three things :—(a) His immaculate birth without the agency of any male, (b) his sayings and doings and (c) his resurrection.

As regards his birth it is said that he was born in the house of David, but if his reputed father Joseph had no hand in his procreation, he being the son of a virgin through God himself, I would like to know how he can be said to belong to the house of David. Next, the two genealogies of Christ in the Gospel of

Mathew Ch. 1. and in Luke Ch. 3 materially differ, so much so, that the two gospels give different names to the grand-father of Jesus. Mathew says, Ch. (1.16.17) "Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary of whom was born Jesus who was called Christ;" ; 3 Luke 20 says that "Heli was the father of Joseph the husband of Mary." If these two evangelists who alone give his genealogy and the details of his birth make such contradictory statements regarding a matter which could be easily ascertained from persons then living, then what becomes of his miraculous birth, as Virgin Mary's conception took place in secret and there could be no eyewitness to it ?

Both Matthew Ch. 1 and Luke Ch. 3, make Jesus descend from David and Renan (Ch. 15 p. 141 et seq) says that the family of David had been long extinct. The real reason why Jesus was called the son of David is that the universal belief was that the Messiah would be the son of David, and would be born at Bethelhem. This expectation of a Messiah being of the house of David and to be born at Bethelhem, was the reason why both Matthew and Luke make Jesus descend from David and Luke places his birth at Bethelhem. Jesus never calls himself the son of David, and once he took exception to this designation, 22 Mat. 41-46, 12 Mk. 35-37, 20 L. 41-44. Renan says that for three centuries many Christians did not believe that the genealogies were correct or that Jesus was descended from David p. 142.

If the above argument of Renan be correct then what becomes of the star which led the wise men to the house in which Jesus was living, 2 Mat. 2, 9, or of the angels who informed the shepherds that "there is born this day in the city of David a Saviour which is

Christ the Lord," 2 L. 11 ? The fact is that these legends were subsequently invented by the evangelists. Mark the earliest writer of the gospel, and John, one of the twelve apostles are silent on the subject, and Mark was the son of Mary, to whose house Peter first went after his miraculous escape from prison 12 Acts 12, which shows his intimacy with the family of Mark to whom he must have communicated all that he knew about Jesus.

Now what is the Bible narrative as to the miraculous birth of Christ ? Matthew says, " After Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost " and Joseph was inclined to put her off but " the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream " and told him that she was conceived of the Holy Ghost and she should not be put off and his son will save his people from their sins. (1 Mat. 18-21). Luke gives a detailed narrative of this matter. He says (Ch. 1. 26 et seq.) that Gabriel came to Mary and told her that she had found favour with God and she will conceive and bring forth a son to be called Jesus who "shall be great and shall be called the Son of the Highest and the Lord God shall give Him the throne of his father David and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever and of his kingdom there shall be no end." (32-33). When Mary asked, " How shall this be, as I know not a man," the angel said, " the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee," and her son " shall be called the Son of God." (34-35).

There is great discrepancy between these two versions, Matthew does not say anything about the meeting of Gabriel with Mary but says that an angel appeared before Joseph in a dream, whereas Luke

does not say anything about Joseph's meeting with the angel, but the angel appeared before Mary not in a dream but in person to inform her of her good fortune. Matthew saw Jesus and his mother but Luke never saw them. He was a fellow traveller with St. Paul (11 Timothy Ch. 4 V 11) who come into the scene after the death of Jesus. So, which story is to be believed? It is very strange that his beloved disciple St. John does not say anything about the birth of Christ.

Luke says that the angel (Gabriel) told Mary that "God shall give Jesus the throne of David and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever and of his kingdom there shall be no end." (1.32-33). Has any of these prophecies of Gabriel been fulfilled? Jesus never got the throne of David and no Jew has ever reigned over Judea from the death of Christ up to this day. The reign of Jesus over the house of Jacob instead of being for ever, never lasted a single day, either in a political or a religious sense, as the Jews have not adopted Christianity and the question of there being no end of his kingdom does not at all arise. So this prophecy of Gabriel has not been fulfilled and there is no chance of its ever being fulfilled.

It appears that the mother and brethren of Christ joined the first prayer meeting of the apostles held after his death (1 Acts. 14) and there is nothing in the New Testament to show that they had previously believed in his godhead. Rather we find in 7 John 5 this express statement, that "neither did his brethren believe in him." See also 13 Mat. 55-57 and 6 Mk. 3 for similar statements. So that we find that his brethren were not his followers and his mother lived with her younger children and did not believe in his

divine mission. When his hearers told him upon his face that his brothers and sisters were not his followers but "lived with us," Jesus admitted the charge by saying that no prophet is honoured "in his own house," 13 Mat. 57 and 6 Mark 4.

In ancient times all people had faith in dreams and omens. Daniel was a great Jewish dreamer and St. John's vision or day dream occupies more space in the Bible than any other dream. Mahomed dreamt that Gabriel once took him to the presence of God and he actually saw Him, and on another occasion he was taken to Jerusalem. The Romans believed in dreams and Hindus still believe in dreams and if they see in their dream the death or severe illness of any dear one, they are morose the whole day and sometimes make a vow in case of illness to offer some sacrifice to a god, or actually perform some expiatory ceremony to appease the wrath of the god. If such a thing can happen in the twentieth century it is not at all surprising that Joseph saw the dream and believed it to be true. But we are not in the first century, and angels and ghosts whose visits even in former times were few and far between have entirely fled from this earth and we no more hear of their visits. If an educated man were to believe to-day such a dream as Joseph saw he would be laughed at by his friends. No man of sense would upon this testimony of Matthew and Luke hold that Virgin Mary's son Jesus was procreated by God. Further, the Gospels do not say that God procreated Jesus, but the paternity is attributed to the Holy Ghost (1 Mat. 18, 20. 1 L. 35).

A question naturally arises why Mary was selected by God above all women for his bride. It is

admitted by every body that with God nothing is impossible. Why then did God select a married woman though yet a virgin and not an unmarried virgin? Further God could have created a new man, just as he created Adam, and thus avoided suspicion being cast upon the character of a woman, married or unmarried, virgin or not a virgin. In any case, whether a man be born of both his parents or of one only through divine agency, he must partake of the evils which the flesh is heir to, and of the guilt of the original Sin incurred by the parents' ancestors, Adam and Eve, whose descendants, including the future Virgin Mary were cursed by God and therefore to whom the curse attached and it is for the redemption of that original Sin that Jesus came down to this world of ours. Under these circumstances it would have been better if Jesus had not descended from Adam and Eve.

That he was 'supposed' to be the son of Joseph the son of Heli is admitted by Luke (3.23). He was also taunted with being the son of a carpenter, as Joseph was indeed a carpenter. Now the contemporaries of Jesus were mostly his enemies and they ultimately brought him to the grave in the very flower of his youth. Many of them were Pharisees, scribes and publicans, whom he took every opportunity to abuse and to expose. They were naturally his enemies. Would they have refrained from taunting him with being a bastard as they were not ignorant of the secret visit of Gabriel to Mary announcing the happy news of her conception by the agency of God, as no such thing had ever happened in Jewish history or is mentioned in the Old Testament? If Mary had proclaimed her supernatural conception

then only could her contemporaries know of the fact, otherwise not, and if she were to do so no one would have believed her, but rather would have said that she invented this story to screen her guilt. But no where in the Bible do we find the slightest allusion made by his contemporaries to his mother's guilt, but they all, including his bitterest enemies, call him the son of Joseph the carpenter (13 Mat. 55 and 6. Mark 3). This is a very strong argument in favour of Christ's legitimacy and I am sorry that the evangelists, in order to deify Jesus, have given him a supernatural origin forgetting that the mouth of scandal cannot be stopped by ascribing supernatural origin to any human being. For my part I am very reluctant to throw any possible suspicion on the character of the mother of such a semi divine being as Jesus Christ. Christians call her a saintly woman and I fully agree with them and I do not wish to cast any aspersion upon the character of such a saint, though I do not believe that she did anything for this world or taught mankind any noble truth, but she rather lived with her younger children and was not a follower of her divinely gifted son. This may be an argument against God's choosing her as a spouse but we have no right to raise any controversy about Christ's legitimacy, the only evidence for his supernatural origin being the secret visits of Gabriel to Mary or to Joseph in a dream of which the evangelists could know nothing, and which is against the testimony and beliefs of his contemporaries.

That the contemporaries of Jesus, among whom were many of his enemies believed in his natural origin is proved by the facts (1) that he was called the carpenter's son (13 Mat. 55 and 6 Mk.3) his father

Joseph having been a carpenter, (2) that he was called Joseph's son (2 Luke 48, 3 Luke 23, 4 Luke 22, and I John 45), (3) that he was called the son of David (Mat. 16, 9 Mat. 27, 12 Mat. 23, 15 Mat. 22, 20 Mat. 30 21 Mat. 9, 15, 22 Mat. 42, 12 Mk. 35, I Luke 32, 69 18 Luke 38, 20 Luke 41, 2 Acts. 30, 2 Tim. 2, 8, 22 Rev. 16). How could he be called the Son of David if Joseph did not procreate him ?

Further, there is not much in this miraculous birth. Every birth is a miracle in one sense and no birth can take place without God's will. It appears that modern science has discovered a means to impregnate female frogs without the agency of a male frog. The male only stimulates and sets in motion the female's eggs (ova) and if some means could be devised to do this, there would be plenty of immaculate births.

"When Costellat informed Reaumur that he had reared perfect silkworms from the eggs laid by a virgin moth, the answer was *ex nihilo nihil fit*, and the fact was disbelieved. It was contrary to one of the widest and best established laws of nature, yet it is now universally admitted to be true, and the supposed law ceases to be universal." (Wallace, *Miracles* etc. p. 38).

As regards the immaculate conception of Virgin Mary, there is a much stronger argument against it than the above. Jesus had brothers and sisters, they are often mentioned in the Gospel (12 Mat. 46, 13 Mat. 55, 3 Mk. 31, 6 Mk. 3, 8 Luke 19, I Act. 14, 2 John 12, 7 John 5). Now what was the relation between Jesus and his mother and the brothers and sisters ? When they came to Jesus, who was then preaching, somebody told him that they desired to approach him and speak to him but that they could not do so on account of the crowd around him. Instead of saying "bring

my mother and brothers and sisters to me," he said "who is my mother and who are my brethren?" And he stretched forth his hand towards his disciples and said, "behold my mother and my brethren, for whosoever will do the will of my Father which is in Heaven the same is my brother and sister and mother" (12 Mat.46-50,3 Mk.31-35, 8 Luke 19-21).

Now this shows that the relation between Jesus and his mother and brothers were not happy and it further shows that his mother lived with her younger children and did not believe in his mission. Now if any person knew who the real father of Jesus was, it was his mother. According to the hypothesis Mary knew that God was the father of Jesus and his brothers were the children of Joseph. Why did then Mary live with her younger children and forsake the eldest whom she knew to be the Son of God? Is that humanly probable? Does it not throw very great doubt upon the paternity of Jesus by God? Certainly if she knew that Jesus was the son of God she ought to have been one of his disciples from the very beginning, but from the above saying of Christ it appears that she did not follow his teachings and therefore did not live with him and Christ did not treat her as he should have treated his mother. To me this argument appears to be unanswerable. Can any sane mother decline to follow the sayings of her divinely begotten son and forsake him and live with other children born of flesh and blood?

So much for the immaculate conception. Now just after the birth of Jesus the shepherds who lived near were informed of this fact by the Lord's angel and suddenly many angels appeared and praised God, and the shepherds repaired thither to see him. (II

Luke 8-14), but the other gospels are silent about this matter. Here again angels, who now-a-days never appear before men, appeared before these shepherds.

The wise men of the East saw the star of the infant Jesus and came to see him being guided by this star to the place where Jesus was, and when this star stopped over the house where Jesus was, they found him and worshipped him. Now what is the meaning of the motion of the star and its sudden stoppage? Even the nearest star is so distant from the earth that its apparent motion except that caused by the earth's diurnal rotation is not perceptible to the eye, and there can be no such thing as the sudden stoppage of any heavenly body unless it comes into collision with some other body, when one or both of them will explode and be turned into gas. The statement of the evangelist Matthew Chapter 2 is opposed to Newton's first law of motion. The fact is that the evangelists had no idea of the motions of the heavenly bodies. Not only the evangelists but even the prophets had no correct knowledge on the subject, else, how could the Bible state that in order to enable the Jews to avenge themselves upon the Amorites, God ordered the Sun and Moon to stand still a whole day (10 Joshua 12,13) and they did so. The dial of Ahaz was also turned back ten degrees, 20,(2 Kings) 11, 38 Isai 8. Can any astronomer explain these? It seems that the writer of the Mahabharata, who lived long before the evangelists, had better notions on the subject. Arjuna had vowed that he would kill Jayadratha before sun-set as the latter had killed his son Abhimanyu, the sister's son of Krishna, by unfair means. Arjuna could not find his opponent before it was nearly evening, when he found his opponent he

was guarded by six great generals. Krishna covered the sun with his disc and it became dark and every body thought that it was night and Jayadratha came out into the open and approached Arjuna when the disc was suddenly removed by Krishna and it became clear day light and Arjuna immediately slew Jayadratha. So the author of the Mahabharata, instead of stopping the course of the sun merely states that Krishna caused a temporary darkness to prevail in the field of battle just as a similar darkness is stated to have overcast the earth when Jesus gave up his ghost on the cross, 23 Luke 44. I believe no Hindu writer has narrated any interference with the course of any heavenly body, whether it be the sun or moon or star or a planet or comet. When the sun approached Kunti at her request and impregnated her, it is not stated that the sun stopped in his course. The material sun moved in its regular course but the presiding deity of the sun came to Kunti at her request. When the infant Hanuman within a few hours of his birth felt hungry, he saw the sun rising in the east and mistaking it for a golden fruit, jumped to catch it and fell upon the shoulders of the demon called Svarbhanu in the Rig. Veda and Rahu (shade) in later writings, who was just then devouring the sun which it does every time when an eclipse occurs. (Sat. P. Br. V.3.2.2. Rig-Veda v.40-5-9. Ramayana Bk.7 Ch.27.) Rahu went to complain to Indra with the infant monkey sticking on his shoulders. But the sun is not stated by Valmiki, the author of the Ramayana, to have moved out of its course or stopped in the midst of it, in order to accompany Rahu. It was only the Sun-god who went to Indra and who at the end gave a remarkable blessing to Hanuman. Krittibas, the popular translator of

Ramayana into Bengali, who lived about five centuries ago is an exception. He makes Hanuman seize the sun and put it in his armpit, but Krittibas was a very modern writer and knew as much of the motions of the heavenly or other bodies as the evangelist himself. So there cannot be any doubt that this part of the story of the coming of the Wise men of the East is incorrect. I do not mean to say that it is an intentional misrepresentation. The gospel was written long after the death of Christ and Mathew had no personal knowledge of the facts but he had to rely upon tradition only. Lastly I would like any Christian to explain to me how to know when a star stops over a house. An astronomer may possibly with the aid of very accurate instrument say that a particular star is just over the earth, but how can he say whether it is just over a particular spot of earth ?

Now as to the return of the Wise men to their home. Herod had asked them to tell him where the boy was before they returned home. They were warned in a dream by the angel of the Lord not to return home by the way they came, and thus avoid meeting Herod (2 Mat. 12) and they did so, and thus Herod was unable to find the whereabouts of Jesus and therefore ordered a general massacre of all infants under two years of age, but fortunately his parents had removed him to Egypt out of the power of Herod as they had been advised to do so by the angel of the Lord in a dream (2 Mat. 13). So here again there are two dreams : in fact dreams seem to play a very important part in Christianity and I believe St. John was the greatest dreamer, and he has left the record of his day dreams in his Revelation. In the first two chapters of Matthew we find mention of five dreams.

Vide I Ch. 10, 2 Ch. 12, 13, 19, 22, besides one in 27 Mat. 19. It appears that Matthew monopolised all the dreams, the other gospels being silent as to dreams, though visions are mentioned in 9 Acts. 3, 10, 7 A. 55, 10 A. 11, 11 A. 5, 16 A. 9, 22 A. 6, 18, 26 A. 13 and 27 A. 23.

It is said that Herod died in the fifth year of Christ when his parents were advised by the angel of Lord in a dream. (2 Mat. 19) that it was now safe to return to Judea and from this period till the thirtieth year of Jesus (3 Luke 23) when he was baptised and commenced his mission, there is practically nothing of importance in his life to be found in the Bible narrative. Practically his mission commenced with the Sermon on the Mount (Mat. Chs. 5-7) which is almost word for word the same as the Sermon on the Plain' (Luke Ch. 6), though the former Sermon is given in much greater detail than the latter, but the leading ideas are the same.

Luke says that Augustus issued a decree for taxing his subjects, "and all went to be taxed, every one into his own city" and Joseph and Mary went to Bethelhem, the city of David, his ancestor, and Jesus was born there. 2-L-1-7. Renan in his Life of Jesus, Ch. 2 P. 42, says that this census took place when Jesus was ten years old, and that this census of Quirinus took place after the deposition of Herod's son Antipas, and so Jesus could not have been born at Bethelhem in Herod's time. So either Matthew's or Luke's story is wrong, as, if Jesus was born at the time of taking the census, then Herod had been dead some years ago, and Herod, a dead man, could not have ordered the Massacre of the Innocents. If on the other hand he was born in Herod's lifetime, then Luke

is wrong as the census which necessitated the journey to Bethelhem, took place long afterwards. The real fact is that both the versions are untrue. Matthew an apostle of Jesus wrote his gospel in Hebrew (Renan, Intro.P.8.) which is not extant and the present gospel according to Matthew being in Greek is not his gospel. Luke, a non Jew (4 Col 11,14) and a companion of Paul, 21 Acts 18 and 27 Acts 1 and by occupation a physician 4 Col. 14, never saw Jesus and wrote from hearsay (1 L. 2). So, many errors naturally crept in his story of the nativity of Christ.

Renan has thus shewn that Jesus was not born at Bethelhem. But 2 Mat. 1 and 2 L. 4 both say that he was born there. This was written with a purpose. In 5 Micah. 2 we find a prophecy that the "ruler in Israel" will be born there, "whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting." It is to fulfil this prophecy of Micah that both Matthew and Luke put his birth place at Bethelhem. So in the very beginning of these two gospels we find an inaccuracy, and one or both of the two genealogies in these two gospels must be wrong. It is very strange that there should be such serious mistakes at the very start, as these facts could easily have been ascertained, by Matthew at any rate, from the mouth of Jesus himself. This shews that legends began to grow up from the very beginning.

In the preceding pages I have briefly stated my views about Christianity. I have tried to show that the birth of Christ was a natural event, that he was as legitimate as any of us, that no aspersion can be cast upon the character of Virgin Mary, nor can God or the Holy Ghost be charged with having procreated Jesus upon another's wife I have shown also that the stories connected with the taking of census, his birth in an

inn in Bethelham in the time of Herod, his descent from David, the angel's visit to the shepherds, the star of Bethelhem, the wise men of the East, massacre of the Innocents by Herod and flight to Egypt in fact everything connected with the life of Jesus till the commencement of his mission in the thirtieth year of his age, are most probably false, fabricated with a definite purpose. Mark's Gsspel, said to be an original gospel is totally silent as to these matters, and John though his identity is disputed, also says nothing about these matters.

CHAPTER 2.

CHRIST'S BAPTISM.

We hear almost nothing of Jesus until he was nearly thirty years old when he was baptised in the river Jordan, the Ganges of the Jews, by John the Baptist. 3 Mat. 13-15. The word baptism means a dip, the whole body being immersed in the water. Every Hindu takes a dip daily and performs some religious ceremony, either reciting some mantras or worshipping Shiva or Krishna with oblations of water and flower. Why this baptism of Jesus had more efficacy than any other baptism the Bible does not explain. This custom is not peculiar to the Hindus, for, among the Jews, the immersion of the whole body, in running water if possible, was a means of washing away all ceremonial uncleanness. 1 Isai 16. This custom was prevalent also among the Egyptians and the Persians, and it was perhaps borrowed by the Jews from the above peoples, with whom they had to reside for some time.

When a child or a grown up man is baptised, the priest consecrates the water by a prayer and usually sprinkles water over him followed by imposition of hands and then the child or man is supposed to be free from the taint of the original sin, and all sins committed up to the time of baptism are forgiven, and the Holy Ghost finds it easy to enter the body. The early fathers had various theories regarding baptism, but St. Augustine's theory still holds the field among Catholics. He taught among other things that the Church was the body of Christ and a man could only enter this body by the door of baptism,

when the Holy Spirit enters his body and it alone can impart spiritual gifts to the children of God. This baptism is thought to be necessary to salvation. The passages referring to baptism are :—28 Mat. 18-20, 16 Mark 16, 3 J. 26, 2 Acts. 38, 8 Acts. 16-18, 10 Acts. 44, 19 Acts. 1, 22 Acts 16, 6 Rom. 10, 1 (1 Cor) 14-16, 6(1 Cor) 11, 5 Eph. 26, 2 Col. 12, 10. Heb. 22, 23.

After the baptism Jesus came out of the water "and lo, the heavens were opened unto him and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove and lighting upon him, and lo, a voice from heaven saying. This is my beloved son in whom I am well pleased". 3 Mat. 16-17, 1 Mk. 10-11, 3 Luke 21-22. Christians believe that the Holy Ghost descends upon every one who is baptised, though we find that some people had to be twice baptised in order to receive the Holy Ghost. It appears from 19 Acts. 2-6 that some people who were believers in Christianity had been baptised unto John's baptism, but had not received the Holy Ghost, nay, not even heard of it, and Paul baptised them in the name of Jesus Christ, and laid his hands on them, and then they got the Holy Ghost. In another place, 8 Acts 14-17, some people had failed to obtain the Holy Ghost though they had been baptised in the name of Jesus Christ and they received it only after Peter and John had laid their hands on them. This laying of hands did not occur in the case of Jesus. The Bible does not say that John the Baptist laid his hands on him. But we find that Moses was ordered by God to lay his hands on Joshua whom God chose as his successor, and Moses carried out God's order. Jesus also laid his hands for curing diseases or for blessing, 19 Mat. 15, 10 Mark 16, 4 Luke, 40, but it is not mentioned anywhere in the Bible that he laid his

hands on any one so that he might receive the Holy Ghost though his apostles often performed this ceremony to bring down the Holy Ghost on any one, 6 Acts 6, 8 Acts 17, 19 Acts 6, 4 (1 Tim) 14.

There are various passages in the New Testament to show that the heaven was opened and a voice came from it or from the clouds. They are 3 Mat. 16, 17, 17 Mat. 5, 1 Mk. 10-11, 9 Mk. 7, 3 Luke 21, 22, 9 Luke 35, 12 John 28, 26 A. 14, 1 (2 Pet) 17. This voice from heaven is the exact equivalent of the Sanskrit *akasbani*, meaning the same thing. When the God of love was burnt to ashes by the fire proceeding from Shiva's third eye, his wife prepared to commit sati with her husband, and a voice (*bani*) from heaven (*akas*) came and told her not to die and she gave up her design. Kali Das, Kumar Sambhaba Canto 3 I would like to know if any *akasbani* has been heard after the death of Jesus Christ, Peter and Paul. After this *akasbani*, and the descent of the Holy Ghost, Jesus was led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil "and he fasted 40 days and 40 nights just as the wandering Israelites did under the leadership of Moses. 4 Mat. 1-2, 1 Mk. 12-13, 4 Luke 1-2. The devil then took him upon the top of a high mountain and showed him all the kingdoms of the world and Jesus was offered all these if he would worship Satan. Jesus of course declined the offer. 4 Mat. 8-10, 4 Luke 4-8. A question naturally arises, how can any one see all the kingdoms of the earth from a high mountain, even from the top of Mount Everest. Was the earth flat then, as a round opaque earth prevents any one from seeing anything beyond the horizon. This shows that these two evangelists believed that the earth was flat and were much behind

Plato, who lived four centuries before the New Testament was written, in their knowledge of the figure of the earth.

The above quotations mention three things :

1. The heavens were opened, 2. The Holy Ghost descended like a dove and 3. A voice from heaven cried. The heavens opened to a lesser being. When Peter fell asleep through excessive hunger, he saw the heaven open and a vessel descending unto him, 10 Acts. 10-11. The unbeliever will say that when a man is very hungry he is apt to see many strange things.

CHAPTER 3.

HIS SAYINGS.

Now let us examine the sayings of Christ. According to 5 Matthew, Christ went up unto a mountain and began to preach, and this is known as the Sermon on the Mount, but Luke says he came down and stood in the Plain to preach (6 Luke 17). The opening words of Jesus in 5 Matthew are exceedingly good but what does he mean by saying in verse 17 that he did not come to destroy the law or the prophets, and saying "I am not come to destroy but to fulfil" and that "it is easier for heaven and earth to pass than one tittle of the Law to fail" 6 Luke 17. By Law he means the law of Moses. Does he mean to say that he agrees with the laws promulgated by Moses in the name of the Lord, some of which are extraordinary such as "a tooth for a tooth an eye for an eye" 21 Ex. 24, 24 Lev. 20 and the most extraordinary is in 17 Deut 2-5 which says that an idolater and worshipper of the sun or moon shall be stoned to death? Did Christ mean to enforce these terrible laws though they are alleged to have been given by God to the Israelites through Moses. There are many other laws promulgated by Moses in the name of God which would make any civilised nation wonder and which even the Jews do not follow to-day. One single instance will show that the law of Moses was inhuman and is not followed in any country, not even by the Jews. In 15 Num. 32-36 we find that a poor man was gathering sticks on a sabbath day. He was brought before Moses and Aaron and God ordered that the congregation should kill him by stoning him and God's

order was carried out and the man died. This was because God had ordered that no work be done on that day and no one could even kindle a fire on that day, 35 Ex. 3. God had often ordered the strict observance of the sabbath 20 Ex. 8, 31 Ex. 13, 35 Ex. 2, 19 Lev. 30, 26 Lev. 2, 5 Deut 12. Did Christ mean to say that the law of sabbath was to be so strictly observed? We find that the disciples of Jesus were breaking the sabbath in his presence by plucking the ears of corn from the fields and eating them on a sabbath day, and when the Pharisees remonstrated against the conduct of the disciples in breaking the sabbath, Christ justified their conduct and said that he was the Lord of the sabbath. 12 Mat. 1-8, 2 Mk. 23-28. On another occasion he worked a miracle on that day by curing a withered hand, 12 Mat. 13, 3 Mk. 5, 6 Luke 10, though he admitted its institution for the benefit of man 2 Mk. 27 and was present at Synagogue worship on sabbath days, 6 Mk. 2, 4 Luke 16, 6 Luke 6, 13 Luke 10. Are not Christ's conduct and his sayings about sabbath contradictory? It remained for Paul to break though this law of sabbath 14 Num. 5, 6, 2 Col. 16, 17 as the early Jewish Christians had to observe both the sabbath and the Lord's day. Christians have given up the observance of the sabbath, though Christ had said that he came not to destroy but to fulfil the law. The fact is Christians do not at all follow the law of Moses, and believe only in the history of the creation and man's fall, besides other historical narratives in the Old Testament. They also believe in the plagues of Egypt, the drying up and filling up of the Red Sea and many other historical matters in the Old Testament, but they do not follow what is called the 'law' of Moses.

So in this matter either Christ was wrong or his followers do not accept his saying that he came to fulfil and not to destroy the law, and Christians do not claim to follow Christ's saying in this matter. I would simply ask all Christians whether they believe that the God of the Jews or the God of any nation could do what is stated in 11 Ex. 2 and 12 Ex. 35-36. These verses state that God advised the Israelites to borrow from the Egyptians gold and silver jewels and raiment, "and the Lord gave the people favour in the sight of the Egyptians so that they lent unto them such things as they required. And they spoiled the Egyptians". This was after God had advised them to fly from Egypt, so that the Israelites could easily avoid returning the jewels and other articles and appropriate or misappropriate them. I need not ask any question about God's inflicting so many plagues upon the unhappy Egyptians for the fault of their obstinate Pharaoh. For any part I disbelieve the whole story, as God is incapable of such conduct and I believe the whole book is apocryphal.

Further it appears that Christ followed the Jewish law in many respects. He attended Synagogues on sabbath days and attended Jewish feasts, particularly the feast of Passover which he attended every year, when he visited the Temple and it was on one of these occasions that he was seized, condemned, and put to death, 2J.13, 5J.1 7J.2-10, 10J.22 So Christ did not destroy the law but followed it. He believed in the story of the origin of the Passover feast and therefore attended it every year and ate the paschal lamb. In fact it is difficult to find in the Bible any condemnation by Jesus of anything to be found in the five books of Moses. He believed in the

ceremonial law^a of Moses, for after he had cured a man of leprosy, he ordered the man to "show thyself to the priest and offer the gift that Moses commanded for a testimony unto them." 8. Mat. 4.

In 5 Mat verse 22 Jesus says "whosoever shall say (to his brother) fool shall be in danger of hell fire." Here he speaks very lightly of hell fire, of which in another place he gives a terrible description. In 5 Mat. 39 he says that if you are struck on the right cheek, turn the left also. This is similar to the saying of Budha who lived five centuries before, who said "return good for evil" but Confucius his contemporary, being of a practical turn of mind, says that injury should be repaid with justice, though he also preached the doctrine of universal charity.

In 5 Mat. 44 he says "*love your enemies*, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you." This is truly a noble saying and Jesus was himself a living example of loving his enemies, when he said, speaking of his crucifiers, "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do." 23 Luke 34, the other gospels being silent upon this point. But Jesus often cursed cities 10. Mat. 16, 11 Mat. 20-23, 6 Mark 11, 10 Luke 12-16 and his present generation was called by him serpents and generation of vipers 12 Mat. 34, 23 Mat. 33. Jesus says love your enemies, but where does he say love all men? Now what is love? Is it an active or a passive feeling? It is possible to love all men by not harbouring any feeling of hatred against anybody. And this is practical love. If love be an active feeling it is impossible to love all men, most of whom one can never expect to see or to benefit by some act of

charity. Many people have made inventions which have benefited mankind, such as the invention of written characters, writing materials, clothing, building houses, etc. or discovered something which has saved lives or reduced bodily pain, such as chloroform or antiseptic surgery. Did they make these inventions and discoveries out of love of mankind? I believe not, though their labours have been of more benefit to mankind than the sayings of all the teachers of religion who have appeared in the course of centuries, for the simple reason that these benefits are tangible, visible, and certain, and there is no difference of opinion regarding their utility, whereas the doctrines of religion relate to what will happen after death, a matter about which there can be no certainty and no two religious teachers agree on any important dogma of religion. So love or no love these men have done immense good to mankind.

The above saying of Christ is opposed to the spirit of the Mosaic law, which preached the doctrine of revenge, "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth" etc., 21 Ex. 24, 24 Lev. 20, 19 Deut 21. The Mahabharata also preaches the same law (Universal Religion by Maitreya p. 24). But Plato anticipated this very saying of Jesus. (Universal Religion p. 24), and Plato was anticipated by the great Buddha. "Hatred does not cease by hating at any time, hatred ceases by not hating, this is its nature." Dhammapada Ch. 1. V. 5, and Ch. 17. V, 3. The Sama Veda anticipated all of them. "Let one bridge over the otherwise unbridgeable stream of hatred by non-hate." Sama Veda Chhanda Archika 6-1-9. "*Akrodhena Krodham*." In China also we find the same precept. Before Buddha and Jesus preached this doctrine of

love, Taoism had preached it. "Requite injury with kindness." (Giles : Sayings of Laotzee p. 51., Legge : Texts of Taoism Vol. 1. p. 92). Confucius (551-478), the contemporary of Buddha also said "love all men." So we see that this golden rule of love, or charity in the sense of St. Paul, was not for the first time preached by Christ but had been inculcated by religious teachers at least 500 years before him. When Confucius was asked what he thought of repaying injury with kindness, he replied, "then how would you repay kindness, therefore repay injury with justice and kindness with kindness," and on another occasion he said, the sons of the murdered man should pursue and slay the murderer. The Srimadbhagbata also prohibits the taking of revenge : "even when blamed, deceived, cursed, despised, hurt, the votaries of the Supreme Lord do not verily take revenge upon the offender although potent to do so" Bk. 1 Ch. 18 V. 48.

The Koran also gives similar precepts. In Ch. 16 V. 128, it says "if you make reprisals, then make them to the same extent that ye were injured, but if ye can endure patiently, best will it be for the patiently enduring," and in Ch. 41 v. 34 it says, "moreover, good and evil are not to be treated as the same thing. Turn away evil by what is better and lo he between whom and thyself was enmity, shall be as though he were a warm friend."

No doubt these noble sayings are very fine reading for the idealist, but if men were enjoined to love all their enemies, then justice would fly from this world and mankind would cease to exist. The idea itself is utopian, and too often this charity is the negation of morality. If we were to love and pardon all thieves,

would society exist? Every body would rob others. Thieves are no respecter of persons. Seneca lived in very poor style, being a Stoic and had very few belongings. But one day he found that his oil lamp had been stolen. If thieves could be so mean minded as to steal such a worthless article, what would be the fate of rich people? They would be robbed of all their wealth. Therefore this form of charity is not for the benefit of mankind, but would be the cause of their ruin, and therefore I should think that this saying of Jesus is not a practical form of what charity should be, never hate any man, though you should hate his vices, so that one should hate murder but never hate the murderer but rather pity him. I should think that this is the best form of charity—ahimsa parama dharma, non-hate is the highest virtue. I would therefore prefer the doctrine enunciated in Dhammapada, the doctrine of non-hate, to this preaching of Jesus: "Him I call the true saint, who, armed with the strength of unshakable forgiveness, submits to the extreme penalties of the fetters and the gallows, without feeling the least hatred towards his enemies, although fully conscious of his own perfect innocence." Dhammapada Ch. 26.v.17. I fully agree with this view and say that the man who never hates another is a real saint, and that this precept is better than "love your enemies." If the saying must be as sententious as the other, then I would say "hate none."

In Matthew 6 verses 9-13, also 11 L. 2-4, there is the celebrated Lord's Prayer. Let us examine it. I quote the whole of it. "Our Father which art in Heaven Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven. Give

us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil, for thine is the kingdom and the power, and the glory for ever, Amen." This is the prayer enjoined by him. The prayer in 11 Luke 2-4 is almost in the same words but Luke omits the last thirteen words commencing with "for thine" and substitutes "sins" for "debts," and this is better and more spiritual. Now what does Jesus mean by saying "Our Father which art in heaven?" Is heaven the sole or usual place of residence of God? Every believer in God believes that God is everywhere, pervading all space; so God has no particular residence. Therefore Christ is clearly wrong here. He thought that God resides in the upper regions known as heaven, which is "God's throne" 5 Mat. 34. In 8 John 23 he says "ye are from beneath, I am from above," i.e. God's dwelling place. Every man when he invokes God or any other deity looks upward believing that God is in the firmament above. When Jesus blessed and broke the loaves for distribution among the multitude he looked up to heaven, 14 Mat. 19, 6 Mk. 41, 6 Luke 16. Formerly it was the belief of every body that the sun and moon go round the earth every 24 hours. No body ever thought that the earth moves round its axis before Aryabhata, born in the year 476 A.D., started the theory of the diurnal motion of the earth round its axis, promulgated by Copernicus in Europe about one thousand years after. So Christ and his contemporaries believed that the firmament above and the earth beneath were fixed in relation to each other and the earth was supposed to have no motion, either diurnal or annual. Jesus

therefore placed God in the heaven above him, forgetting that in twelve hours that heaven would be towards his feet. If Christ meant by heaven the firmament above him, then what would be the heaven of those who resided far from Judea, for every country has its own firmament above it? So the heaven is above every body and surrounds this earth. I believe Jesus thought that the earth is a flat body which was immovable and there was no heaven on its four sides or below it. In 4 Mat 8 we find that Jesus was taken to the top of a high mountain by the devil who showed him "all the kingdoms of the world." Was the world flat then? Else how could Jesus see the kingdoms on the other side of this opaque sphere? This shows that Christ was not aware of the fact that the earth was a sphere, though Plato, who lived nearly four centuries before him, and others, believed that the earth was a sphere. It appears that education was very low in Judea, and its people were ignorant of the science of Astronomy and most other sciences known to the contemporaries of Christ outside Judea. Now what am I to say of a person who did not know that the earth was a sphere and that it revolved round its axis? Can such an ignorant person be the supreme God? It does not matter whether he be God the Father, or God the Son, as all Christians follow the doctrine laid down by the Council of Nice which established the doctrine of Trinity with the three Godheads, God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Ghost, as consubstantial, consisting of the same substance. Is it not a strange thing that God the Son did not know anything which modern astronomers have discovered? To my mind this ignorance is enough to disprove the godhead of Christ?

Regarding this Father which is in Heaven, or as he is called in other places Heavenly Father, I may be permitted to say that Christ took this idea from the Greeks, whose Zeus Pater is equivalent to Sanskrit Dyaush Pitar or Latin Jupiter (Max Muller's Hibbert Lectures pp. 276,288). Dyaush Pitar means Heavenly Father, Dyaus meaning sky or heaven. This word shows that the ancients believed that God resided in the sky above, an idea which Jesus borrowed from them. He even thought that God's throne is in heaven (5 Mat. 34). The belief of the ancients was that the earth had no motion and the heaven above was fixed in relation to the earth. Mohamed says that the sky and earth formed one rigid body in the beginning, afterwards separated from each other. Koran Ch. 21 Vs. 31-33.

The expression Father in Heaven or Heavenly Father is mentioned by Jesus several times. The verses containing this expression are as follows:— 5 Mat. 1, 16, 34, 45, 48. 6 Mat. 1, 9, 32. 7 Mat. 21, 10 Mat. 32, 33. 14 Mat. 19 when Jesus looked up to heaven and blessed the loaves and fishes, 16 Mat. 17, 18 Mat. 10, 14, 35, 11 Mark 25, 12 Mark 26 and 11 Luke 2.

Then he asks for his daily bread (v.11) though in a previous sentence (v.8) he had said that "your Father knoweth what things ye have need of before you ask him." If God knows my wants then why should I ask bread or anything from him? In 6 Mathew 25 he asks people "to take no thought for your life what ye shall eat and what ye shall drink" and in the next verse he says that God feeds the fowls of the air. In verses 31, 32 he says "take no thought saying what shall we eat or what shall we drink, or

wherewithal shall we be clothed (for after all these things do the Gentiles seek) for your Heavenly Father knoweth that we have need of all these things" and in verse 34 he says "take therefore no thought of the morrow, for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself." Do not the above sayings go to show that God will supply our wants and need not take thought of them ? Here I find a contradiction, prayer for bread and no necessity for thinking of bread.

Then he says "forgive our debts as we forgive our debtors" (verse 12) Luke uses the word "sins" for "debts" as stated above. Christ meant to use the word debts as debts to God or sins. So there can be no objection to this saying.

He ends the prayer by saying, "and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For thine is the kingdom, and the power and the glory for ever" (verse 13). I have nothing to say regarding the last sentence. But what does he mean by saying "lead us not into temptation." These words are repeated by Luke (11 Luke 4). Does God and did God lead anybody into temptation ? It is the business of Satan to tempt man as he tempted Jesus after his baptism when "Jesus was led up of the Spirit unto the wilderness to be tempted of the devil," (4 Matthew 1), a very nice job for the Spirit to throw anybody into the jaws of the devil. Here Jesus does an injustice to God, who never leads to but brings back from temptation.

If anybody compares the Lord's prayer in the Bible with that in the Koran (Chapter 1) he will find that Mahomed ought to get the palm of victory as his prayer is unquestionably the better of the two. I transcribe it in full for comparison. "Praise be to

God, the Lord of all creatures, the most merciful, the king of the day of judgment. Thee do we worship, and of thee do we beg assistance. Direct us in the right way, in the way, of those to whom thou hast been gracious, not of those against whom thou art incensed, nor of those who go astray." (Sale's Koran). Rodwell translates the last line thus: "With whom thou art not angry and who go not astray." The latter translation ought to be preferred, though it attributes anger, a human weakness, to God.

The Sermon on the Mount is one of the most ennobling and edifying lessons on man's conduct towards man and the foundation of Christ's religion was the unity of God, love of god and love of neighbour, 22 Mat. 36-40, 12 Mark 29-31, 10 Luke 27. It is difficult to find anything higher or nobler in any other system of religion and I believe that barring the question of the existence and unity of God, there are only two religions which base themselves on the love of Man and other beings, in which they are better than the religion of Christ who never speaks a word about inferior animals which Mahomed does in his Koran, Vide Ch.6 v.39 and the Mahomedans believe that not only mankind but the Genii and irrational animals also shall be judged on the day of resurrection when the unarmed cattle shall take vengeance on the horned till entire satisfaction shall be given to the injured. Sale's Koran, Preliminary Discourse Sec. 4 p. 67. I refer to the religion of Buddha and the religion of Humanity. The Hindu, Jewish, and the Mahomedan religions do not inculcate the love of mankind. As I have already said the Hindu and Jewish religions are very exclusive. Those religions exist only for their followers. No non-Hindu is per-

mitted to enter the fold of the Hindu religion and accept its blessings, and the Hindu religion makes a great distinction between the Hindu and the non-Hindu, and even among Hindus makes a great distinction between peoples of different castes. In fact it cannot do otherwise seeing that it promulgates the doctrine that men were originally created into four distinct classes. So there is an initial inequality between man and man. Similarly the Jewish religion is for Jews only and their god exists only for them. Among ancient religions Buddhism, Christianity and Mahomedanism are the only proselytising religions and any human being can enjoy the blessings of those religions and seek the way to salvation laid down by them.

Jesus in one place very nearly reaches the height of the Geeta. He says in 13 L. 13-14, "But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind, and thou shalt be blessed, for they cannot recompense thee, for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just." This very nearly approaches the doctrine of the Geeta about nishkam dharma, the doing of works without any expectation of reward or benefit. This is a very noble precept. How far this is philosophically correct I do not pretend to say. Bain says that nothing is done without a motive behind it. The Svetashwara Upanished Ch. 4. V. 7 says the same thing. But the Geeta says do your duty without expectation of reward or benefit, Ch. 2 Vs. 45-49, Ch. 18 V. 6. But what will determine my duty? Certainly the result of my action should determine my duty. If the result be bad I should avoid it, if good I should do the work, and that will be my duty. Is there anything

like absolute duty, irrespective of the good or bad result of my action? The author of the Geeta had a motive behind his preaching this doctrine. His object was to make Krishna induce Arjuna to join in the great war and not to retire, and he, being a Brahmin, makes Arjuna yield and perform his duty. And what was his duty? He belonged to the Kshetriya or warrior caste, and therefore his duty was to fight. The whole argument rests upon the respective duties of the four castes, a thing invented by Brahmins. And it was to aggrandise the Brahmins that this doctrine was promulgated. Vyasa, the author of the Bhagavadgeeta is also the author of Vedantasutra and in Ch. 1 Vs. 98-102 he says that Sudras have no right to know God, this knowledge being the exclusive privilege of the three twice born classes, and his book has a long discussion over this matter in support of his view. This author was for aggrandising the Brahmins, and this explains his theory of nishkam dharma. I cannot omit to observe that this Vyasa was the illegitimate son of an unmarried fisherwoman, by a Brahmin, and I fail to see why this psuedo Brahmin would exclude his mother's family from the knowledge of God. I suspect that the whole of the Geeta was written by some Brahmin and incorporated in the immortal work of Vyasa, the Mahabharata. Else why this digression, as the Geeta undoubtedly is? However it is very difficult to say which portions of the Mahabharata are interpolations. There was no printing in those days, and forgery was very easy, and it is an admitted fact that the original Mahabharata contained 100,000 couplets, but now it contains 116,000 couplets. Whence these additional couplets? This shows the

extent of the forgery but it is very difficult to point out which verses were interpolated.

The question may be asked why all men are not Christians. To this, the simple answer is that Christianity does not mean solely what is included in the Sermon on the Mount, and the enunciation of the above basis of the religion of Christ. It includes besides, in the first place, the godhead of Christ. Christ nowhere assumed that position except in one passage in John. He did not call himself the Messiah but in 16 Mat. 16, and 26 Mat. 64 he practically admits that he is Christ the Son of God and he also says, "I and the Father are one" 10 John 30 which he afterwards qualifies as meaning the Son of God, 10 John 36, and every Pantheist says that God and he are one, but in 9 Mat. 6 he assumes the power to forgive sins and in 24 Mat, 13 Mark, and 21 Luke, he says that when the end will come, "the sun shall be darkened and the moon shall not give her light and stars shall fall from heaven and the powers of the heaven shall be shaken" and then, "the son of man will come into the clouds of heaven with power and glory" and he will send the angels to gather the elect. And he winds up by saying that "this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled." In 16 Mat. 27-28 he says that "the Son of man will come into the glory of his Father to reward every man according to his works," and that "there be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom. In 16 Mat. 15-20, Jesus complimented Peter for calling him Christ, the Son of the living God, and said that his Father in heaven has revealed it to Simon Barjona whom he calls Peter (or rock) and to

him he promises to give the keys of heaven. But he charged his disciples that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ. In 25 Matthew 34 Christ says that he will say to the elect when the end comes "inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world," and to the non-elect who will be placed on his left hand he will say, "depart from me ye cursed into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels" v. 41. Though he calls himself the Son of Man which every human being is, he assumes extraordinary powers. He will divide all men into two classes, the elect and the non-elect, and he will pass judgment upon them and will separate the elect who will be saved, from the non-elect who will be damned to everlasting fire. When Jesus was taken to the High Priest, the latter adjured him by the living God whether he was Christ the Son of God, and what was Christ's reply? He said, "thou hast said, nevertheless I say unto you, hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven, 26 Mat. 63-64. In 28 Mat. 19, 14 Mk. 61, 22. L. 70 the resurrected Christ orders his apostles to preach his religion to all nations, "baptising them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost" and to teach men to observe his commandments. 16 Mark 15-16 make the resurrected Christ say to his apostles, to go and preach the gospel to every creature, and Christ says (v. 16) "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved but he that believeth not shall be damned." Luke is silent on the question of baptism or the terrible sentence passed on unbelievers. He says Ch. 24 Vs. 47-48 that the resurrected Christ told his apostles that "repentance

and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations beginning at Jerusalem and ye are witnesses of these things." St. John is totally silent upon this point, he only makes Jesus request Peter to 'feed his sheep' which he repeated thrice, 21 John 15-17.

Jesus started his preaching by saying "Repent for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," 4 Mat. 27 and this repentance is no new method for the remission of sins though the Hindu and the Catholic religions have found other means also for the remission of sins, such as a dip in the Ganges or gifts to Brahmins, and it is well known that the sale of indulgences in the time of Pope Leo X who wanted money for the erection of his Church of St. Peter, was the proximate cause of the Reformation. The Church has assumed the power to forgive sins just as Christ did in 9 Mat. 6. Now we see from the above verses that (1) Christ assumed the power to forgive sins which his Church claims to have inherited from him, (2) that when the end of this world will come and which Jesus expected to come in the lifetime of his generation, he will decide whom to save and whom not to save and he will pass judgment upon the elect and the non elect, (3) that the baptism is to be in the name of the Father, the Son, meaning himself, and the Holy Ghost. What this last is, he nowhere explains. In some places he is called Spirit, in 14 J. 16, 26, 15 J. 26, 16 J. 7, he is called Comforter (Paraclete, Advocate), but his functions are nowhere stated in the Bible. He got the words Holy Ghost from John the Baptist, who used it for the first time. (3 Mat. 11) and it is the quarrel about the meaning of these words which was one of the causes of the

difference between Arius and Athanasius which led to the summoning of the Council of Nice by Constantine the Great which formulated the doctrine of the Trinity. That Christ claimed to be a Redeemer appears from his other sayings also. In the Last Supper he took a cup of wine, blessed it, and gave it to the apostles, saying "this is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for 'many' for the remission of sins." But Luke substituted the word 'you' for 'many' (26 Mat. 28, 14 Mark 24, 22 Luke 20), but St. John is absolutely silent upon this matter.

Next, as regards his other sayings, I find that in 17 Mat. 19, 22 Mat. 36-40, 12 Mark 29-31, 10 Luke 27 Jesus lays down the essence of his doctrine which consists in the love of God and the love of one's neighbour. This idea he borrowed from 19 Lev. 18 and 6 Deut. 4. 5. What he means by the word 'neighbour' I find it very difficult to understand. Does it mean the neighbours of his listeners or the whole human race? He never spoke of the love of mankind as long as he lived, and it is only after his death that he ordered his apostles to preach his doctrines to all people (28 Mat. 19). During his lifetime he showed no sympathy for the Gentiles. When a Syrophenician woman, a Greek by birth, came to request him to come to her house and cure her daughter, what was his reply? He refused to go, saying, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the House of Israel and it is not meet to take the children's bread and to cast it to dogs." The woman's reply was a crushing one and must have left a pang in his heart. She said, "True my Lord, but the dogs eat of the crumbs that fall from the master's table" and Jesus said, "Great is thy faith, be it unto

thee even as thou wilt," and her daughter was cured. This interview with the Syrophoenician woman is narrated in two places 15 Mat. 22-28 and 7 Mark 25-30, and the replies of Jesus and of the woman are stated in almost identical terms, therefore there is every reason to believe that this interview actually took place.

The mission of all religious teachers is and ought to be to further the progress and happiness of all men irrespective of creed, colour and nationality. There are only two exceptions to this rule, the Hindus and the Jews. These people are very exclusive, they would not admit any stranger into their fold and their God or gods are all national gods. No Hindu god is ordinarily invoked for the benefit of humanity at large. Hindus have preached only for the benefit of Hindus, and however pious a man may be, if he is born outside the pale of Hinduism he cannot receive the grace of God which is the exclusive privilege of Hindus, and no Brahmin will officiate at any religious ceremony or take any nourishment at the house of a non-Hindu. None of the ten incarnations of the Hindus has done anything for non-Hindus. Jewish Jehova likewise seems to exist only for the Jews. He is not said to have done anything for the Gentiles, and Christ, being a Jew, was not expected to do anything for any Gentile. In fact the Messianic idea which then prevailed and had previously prevailed in Judea precluded the Messiah from doing anything except for the benefit of the Jews, and Jesus was regarded by his disciples as the Messiah himself. Jesus had no grudge against the Greeks who were no longer conquerors of his country, and so he had no motive to behave

towards the Syrophoenician woman in this manner. The Romans had recently conquered his country and he might naturally dislike them. But what did the diseased daughter of the Greek woman do to induce him to use such harsh language? Archdeacon Farrar, in his *Life of Christ*, says that he writes his book as a firm believer in Christianity and in the divinity of Christ. Even he fails to give a rational explanation of Jesus' conduct towards this woman. He says that Jesus' object was to test the woman's faith in him or to encourage us in our prayers and hopes and teach us to persevere P. 227. That may or may not be so, but still there was no necessity to use such strong and improper language when he refused to minister to a Gentile, and any man of Christ's nobleness of mind should never have refused to treat a sick person because she was not a Jew but a Gentile. Jesus did not mean to tell an untruth. He was incapable of doing so. He must have spoken the truth. He believed that he was the Messiah of the Jews, and the mission of the Messiah is fully stated by Zacharias, the husband of Elizabeth and the father of John the Baptist. This Zacharia was filled with the Holy Ghost and prophesied the birth of Christ by saying that "God hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David" "that we should be saved from our enemies and from the hand of all that hate us, to perform the mercy promised to our fathers and to remember his Holy covenant, the oath which he swore to our father Abraham that he would grant unto us that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies might serve him without fear" "and thou child will give knowledge of salvation unto his people by

the remission of their sins." (1 Luke 67-77). This shows that the Jewish Messiah was to be a national hero whose duty it was to save or deliver the Jews from their enemies which expression is twice repeated in the above speech of Zacharias. Further in 1 Matthew 21 we find that the angel told Joseph in a dream that his Son "shall save his people from their sins." So nowhere do we find that Christ was thought to have come to save mankind from their sins, but to deliver the Jews from the enemies and oppressors of their country. In 1 Luke 77 Zacarias says that Jesus will give knowledge of salvation unto 'his people' by the remission of 'their sins,' 1 Matthew 21 speaks of the saving of 'his people' from their sins, but 1 Luke 71-77 speak also of the delivery of the Jews from 'our' enemies and the remission of 'their' sins which means that Zacharias prophesied that Jesus would be the national hero and drive away the Romans who were then over-lording Judea. So, considering the above statements of Matthew and Luke and the conduct of Jesus towards the Syrophoenician woman, which has in my opinion, lowered him in the estimation of all non-Christians, I am reluctantly compelled to think that Jesus and his disciples thought that he had come for the² house of israel and not for the whole human race.

I am confirmed in this opinion by the fact that Jesus when sending the twelve apostles to preach abroad, commanded them as follows:—

"Go not unto the way of the Gentiles and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not, but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (10 Matthew 5-6). That he sent his twelve disciples is also men-

tioned in Luke Ch. 9, but no direction is there given by Jesus to avoid the Gentiles. If Matthew's statement be correct, what do we find there? The Samaritans were also of Jewish blood, though some of them were of mixed descent, and also followed the Jewish religion, but the principle cause of quarrel with the Jews was about the temple, so that "the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans." 4 John 9. The Jews worshipped the Jehova of Solomon's temple in Jerusalem whereas the Samaritans worshipped the Jehova of their own temple in Gerizim (4 John 20). For this reason there was great religious animosity between the two peoples, and it was so great that the Galileans when going to Jerusalem avoided passing through Samaria and went by a round-about way, and Jesus was once found fault with for having drunk the water of the well of Gerizim. Strauss in his Life of Christ says, that Jesus often avoided passing through Samaria on his annual pilgrimage to the temple of Jerusalem. Jesus told the woman he met with in Samaria "ye worship ye know not what, we know what we worship for salvation is of the Jews." 4 John 22. So Jesus thought that he come to save Jews only and not mankind.

This direction to his disciples to avoid Samaria and the Gentiles shows that Jesus never thought that his mission was for the benefit of the whole human race. In the Sermon on the Mount he says, "Love your enemies and in 22 Mat. 36-40 and 12 Mark 29-30, 10 Luke 27 he says, "Love thy neighbour as thyself." Why should the same Jesus order his disciples to avoid going to Samaria or to avoid the Gentiles? I also find that Jesus sent 70 disciples in batches of two, to preach his doctriue (10 Luke 1) To

them also he gives no direction to preach to the Gentiles, but curses the city which will not receive them. (10 Luke 12-14). See also 10 Mat. 14-15 and 6 Mark 11 where the same curse is given to cities which will not receive his apostles whom he sends to preach. I am therefore compelled on account of his improper treatment of the Syrophœnician woman, and his improper direction to his disciples not to enter the city of the Samaritans, and to avoid the Gentiles, and to go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, coupled with the fact that during his lifetime he never preached to the Gentiles except when he went to Tyre and Sidon where he could make very little impression (10 Luke 13-14) nor even spoke during his life time that he had come for the benefit of the whole human race, and also coupled with the fact that he never selected a single Gentile as one of this twelve apostles (equalling the number of the Jewish tribes) or one of the seventy whom he sent afterwards to preach by batches of two, reluctantly to come to the conclusion that Jesus never in his life time thought that he was sent to preach to the whole world. He has abused the publicans or tax-gatherers who were mostly Gentiles but where does he utter a word of advice to any Gentile? Upon all these grounds one must reluctantly come to the melancholy conclusion that the noble words "Love thy neighbour as thyself," were addressed to the Jews, and not to the Gentiles and the "neighbour" was meant to include Jewish neighbour only. I come to this conclusion with the greatest sorrow.

That the apostles and disciples of Jesus and he himself believed that he had come for Jews only and not for the whole human race is clearly shown by the following verses in the New Testament: 1 Mat. 21,

“Call his name Jesus : for he shall save his people from their sins” 2 Mat. 6, “Out of thee shall come a Governor that shall rule my people Israel.” 10 Mat 5-6, Jesus said “go not unto the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not : but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel” 15 Mat. 24, Jesus said “I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel,” 19 Mat. 28, Jesus said “Ye shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel” 7 Mk. 27, Jesus said “Let the children first be filled” 1 L. 33, the angel said to Mary “He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever” 1 L. 68-69, Zacharias filled with the Holy Ghost said “Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for he hath visited and redeemed his people, and hath raised up an horn of salvation for us,” 1 L. 77, Zacharias said “to give knowledge of salvation unto his people by the remission of their sins,” 24 L. 21, an apostle said after Jesus’ death “but we trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel,” 1 J. 49, Nathaniei told Jesus “Thou art the King of Israel.” 4 J. 22, Jesus said “salvation is of the Jews,” 17 J. 9, Jesus said in his agony just before his arrest, “I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me, for they are thine,” 1 A. 6, the apostles asked Jesus after his resurrection “Lord, will thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel ?” In the whole of the New Testament there is nothing to show that Jesus or his twelve apostles ever said that he had come for the redemption of mankind. On the contrary they maintained and believed that he had come for the Jews only, as their Messiah or temporal deliverer. It was Paul only who says that Jesus came for the Gentiles as well, with this qualification that he came

first for the Jews and then for the Gentiles, 1 Rom. 16, 2 Rom. 10. In fact it was Paul who was the first man to preach to the Gentiles the salvation promised by Jesus to the Jews, and but for him the religion of Christ would have been restricted to the Jews only, and as the Jews have declined to accept the teachings of Christ and acknowledge him as a saviour, the religion of Christ would have died a natural death. So it was Paul who has saved Christianity by extending its blessings to the Gentiles, who are the only followers of Christ, The Jews are still waiting for their Messiah to come and deliver them. So Christians ought to be more thankful to Paul than to Jesus for the religion they follow, for, but for Paul, Christianity would not have been preached to the Gentiles. I believe Paul was a more liberal minded man than Jesus himself. His sympathy was for the Gentiles as well, whereas the sympathy of Jesus was limited to the Jews only, and he even declined to send his twelve apostles to the Gentiles (10 Mat. 5-6), whereas Paul is known as the apostle of the Gentiles. What did Jesus do during his lifetime for the salvation of the Gentiles? It was only after his death that he ordered his apostles to preach his religion to mankind (28 Mat. 19, 16 Mk. 15, 24 L. 47). Jesus never went beyond Tyre and Sidon, where he could gain no success, 11 Mat. 22, 15 Mk. 21, 3 Mk. 8, 7 Mk. 24, 6 L. 17, 10 L. 13, and Tyre is only forty miles from Nazareth, whereas Paul spent the best years of his life in travelling from one country to another and preaching to the Gentiles. The Acts of the Apostles from chapter 13 to the end (28) narrate some of his missionary tours. He died like Jesus a martyr's death. He wrote fourteen epistles whereas Jesus

wrote nothing and the gospels contain many sayings he never uttered. The sermons of Paul, Chapters 12 to 15 Rom., are almost as good as the Sermon on the Mount of Jesus, 5 to 7 Mat. and 6 L. 20-49. Paul's sympathies were wider. He made no distinction between Jews and Gentiles. Not so Jesus. So I cannot believe that Jesus came for the salvation of the whole human race. Again I ask what did Christ do for the Gentiles during his lifetime? He was a Jew and nothing but a Jew in his sympathies. His twelve apostles were all Jews and they were told that they would judge the twelve tribes of Israel on the judgment day, 22 L. 30. The synoptic gospels say that when Pilate asked Jesus whether he was the king of the Jews, he answered "thou sayest it" which means 'yes,' 27 Mat. 11, 15 Mk. 2, 23 L. 3. The crime with which he was charged was not promulgation of new religious doctrines or corrupting the youth of the country for which Socrates had to drink the juice of the hemlock, but it was a political crime, called treason. According to Roman usage Jesus could not have been capitally punished for a crime against the Jewish religion. The accusation written over his head was "this is Jesus king of the Jews" 27 Mat. 36, 15 Mk. 26, 23 L. 38, 19 J. 19. This shows that his accusers and the judge Pilate charged him with a design to deliver the Jews from this temporal subjection to the Romans, and no one ever thought that his mission was to save mankind from their sins.

The Jews had all along expected a Messiah. By this word the Jews understood the founder of an earthly kindgom, a deliverer from foreign yoke. This was the original idea and even the apostles were of the same opinion 20 Mat. 20-21, 24 L. 21, *1 Acts. 6.

Jesus identified himself with the Messiah, 4 J. 26, 26 Mat. 54, 9 Mk. 12, 18 L.31-32, 22 L.37, 24 L. 37, 24 L. 27, 5 J. 39, 46. His apostles preached the same thing. 2 Acts. 16,25, 8 Acts. 28-35, 10 Acts.43, 13 Acts. 23, 32-37, 26 Acts. 22-23, 1 Pet. 1-11, and various passages in Paul's epistles. Daniel chapter 12 also speaks of a deliverer of the Jews. The expected temporal deliverer has been turned into a spiritual deliverer. But not for all, only for the elect.

Jesus is also called a lamb. His last words to his assembled apostles were "feed my sheep," 21 J. 15-17. Where did Jesus get this idea from and why is he called a lamb? A clue to this is found in 53 Isai 3-8 where the redeemer of Israel is likened to a sheep "upon whom the Lord hath the iniquity of us all", and he will not open his mouth, he will be "cut off out of the land of the living, for the transgression of 'my' people was he stricken", v.8. Now as regards the Book of Isaiah, Renan is of opinion that the second part of Isaiah differs from the first not only in style but in date. As to the Book of Daniel, Renan is of opinion that it is apocryphal, which it clearly is, as it pretends to foretell events which took place long ago. Daniel lived in the second century B. C. and the fall of Babylon which took place in the sixth century he pretends to foretell, and Darius will be the conqueror, though history says it was Cyrus and not Darius. (Renan, Intro. pp.4-5)

As already stated the words "love thy neighbour as thyself" are taken from 19 Lev.18. The whole Chapter is a repetition of sundry laws given by God to Moses to be observed by the Jews. To fully understand verse 18 it is necessary to read verses 17, 18, 33 and 34 together. They are as follows :—

17. "Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart, thou shalt not in any wise rebuke thy neighbour, and not suffer sin upon him."

18. "Thou shalt not avenge nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people; but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. I am the Lord."

33. "And if a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not vex him."

34. "But the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you and thou shalt love him as thyself, for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt. I am the Lord your God."

These verses show that the word neighbour refers to the children of 'thy' people, and the dwellers among them. The sojourners are not to be vexed but the permanent dwellers among the Jews are to be loved as 'thyself'. So here also a great distinction is made between strangers who reside temporarily and those who live permanently among the Jews. In fact the God of the Jews who had ordered that if any besieged city does not surrender, then after capture all the males are to be killed and the women and little ones "shalt thou take unto thyself," and had also ordered the wholesale extermination of all the people who resided in the cities which God had delivered unto Moses, "namely the Hittites, the Amorites, the Canaanites, the Perizzites, the Hivites and the Jebusites, as the Lord thy God had commanded thee", so that of these cities thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth" 20 Deut 10-17, how could this God say "love all mankind as thyself". This God of the Jews had ordained that strangers living with the Jews and heathens may be sold as bondsmen but not the Israelites (23 Lev. 39-46) and had also ordered Moses to

wage war against the Midianites and he slew all the males as God had ordered him to avenge the children of Israel of the Midianites", and all the women and children were made captives after which all the married women and the male children were put to death, and the virgins only were kept alive, 31 Num. 1-18. God also ordered Moses to drive away the Caanites and to take possession of their lands, 33 Num. 50-53. Similarly God ordered Moses to go to the land of the Hittites and six other nations, and God promised to deliver them into his hands and Moses was ordered by God to smite and destroy them and not to make any covenant with them or to show them any mercy, or to intermarry with them. 7 Deut 1-6. Moses was also ordered to have no pity upon people which God shall deliver to him, but to consume them 7. Deut 16. In 13 Deut 6-9 God orders the Israelites to kill a brother, sister, wife or friend who shall entice them to follow other gods. Therefore I again repeat the question, could such a God order the Jews to love all men as themselves, as the context shows that this love was to be restricted to Jews only and strangers permanently residing with them?

When a lawyer asked Jesus what he had to do to inherit eternal life, Jesus answered by saying that thou shalt love God with all thy heart and thy neighbour as thyself and the lawyer then asked him "who is my neighbour"? 10 Luke 27. Jesus did not give a direct reply to this very pertinent question, and merely gave an illustration, showing that a Samaritan who shows kindness to a robbed and wounded traveller left half dead on the road and binds his wounds is a 'neighbour' and not the priest or Levite who merely looked at him and passed by. 10 Luke 29-37. Here

Jesus could easily have said that the word neighbour meant the whole human race. Here Jesus falls far short of the religious ideal of Buddha the founder of the universal religion of brotherhood of all sentient beings, man and beast.

Christ's religion is for the poor, whom he liked, as he was himself very poor and said that the foxes have holes to live in but he has no place to lay his head on, 8 Mat. 20. The parable of Dives and Lazarus, 16 L. 19-31, shows his predilection for the poor. In 8 L. 18 he says that "whosoever hath to him shall be given and whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken, even that which he seemeth to have". A man told Christ "suffer me to bury my father", but Jesus told him "follow me and let the dead bury the dead", 8 Mat. 21-22. In another place he told a rich man to sell his all and follow him. 19 Mat. 21, 10 Mk. 21, 6 L. 20, 24, 18 L. 22. This shows Jesus was of opinion that men should forsake everything to follow him. He even said that "if any man came to me and hate not his father, his mother, his wife, and his children and brethren, and sisters, Yea and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple," 14 L. 26. This is an extreme view. He wished every one to forsake everything and follow him. If people were to follow this precept, society would come to an end. His own example was not good. He never married, and except Peter no other apostle seems to have married, as no mention is made of their wives; his chief female disciple, Mary Magdalene, does not seem to have been ever married, the apostle Paul, his greatest disciple, greater than all the other apostles put together, though Christians think Peter to be the rocky foundation upon which Jesus built his church, (16 Mat. 18) never married, and

he was rather opposed to marriage and preferred celibacy, as marriage makes a man care for the things of the world, "how he may please his wife." "The unmarried woman careth for the things of the Lord", 7 (1 Cor.) 32-34. This led to the institution of the orders of monks and nuns, and the theory of mortification of the flesh. Buddhists also follow the above institutions and they also mortify their flesh. But there is this difference. Buddha never enjoined mortification of the flesh, though he preached the doctrine of misery, from which it should be the endeavour of every man ultimately to escape through the process of Nirvana. He fled from his wife and child and led a celibate life, his principal disciples, Ananda and others were celibates, he divided his followers into two classes, the clerical and laity, the first consisting of celibate monks and nuns. He preached the doctrine of a future state. Jesus did the same, the Mosaic law having been totally silent as to a future state and the fathers' iniquity was punished to the third or fourth generation 5 Deut. 9, the father himself escaping all punishment after his death. Both these religious teachers highly extol charity. The only material difference between them is that Jesus believed in a God, whereas Buddha kept silent if he was asked any question about God and soul.

This incidentally leads one to the question whether Jesus got his doctrines from the Buddhists. The gospels with the exception of Luke are silent as to Christ's history from his return from Egypt to the commencement of his mission, that is, from his fifth to the thirtieth year. Luke says that his parents went every year at the feast of passover, and Jesus was on one occasion left behind by his parents, who went a

day's journey, when they missed him, and returned to Jerusalem and found him in the temple sitting in the midst of the doctors both hearing them, and asking them questions. 2 L. 42-50 Jesus was then aged twelve years. This story of his parents going a day's journey before thinking of their child is very strange. At any rate there is a complete blank between his twelfth and his thirtieth year. The apostles Mathew and John ascertained no facts from Jesus about his life during his boyhood, adolescence and youth, after his fifth year. This is very strange as they were his constant companions, but the former writes two chapters about his miraculous birth and some miraculous events and some dreams before his baptism by John, when he was thirty years old. I suspect Jesus travelled towards India and learnt much of Buddhism and Zoroastrianism and incorporated many of their doctrines in his religion. The idea of resurrection is taken from the Persian religion, which had greatly affected the Jewish faith during the long years of captivity of the Jews in Babylon, from 587 to 536 B. C. The ideas of Satan and Paradise had been previously taken by the Jews from them both being words of Persian origin. Practically there is not much in Christ's teaching which may not be found in the teachings of Buddha and Zoroaster. This matter has not seriously been enquired into by any scholar, and I merely throw out a hint for learned scholars to take up. Renan, Farrar, and Strauss were not acquainted with the Buddhist religion and I hope some great scholar will solve this difficult question.

Jesus said "be merciful, even as your Father in Heaven is merciful." He says God is merciful. But was the God of the Jews merciful? He ordained the

law of retaliation, "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth", 21 Ex. 24 and repeated in 24 Lev. 20 and 18 Deut. 21. The Pentateuch puts many words in the mouth of God which show great want of mercy. He gave up the Canaanites, Ammorites and others to Moses to be killed. "And thou shalt consume all the people which the Lord thy God shall deliver thee, thine eye shall have no pity upon them." 7 Deut. 16. These are the commands of God to Moses. God is said to have ordered the killing of idolaters 22 Ex. 20 and of near relations if they entice a man to idolatry 13 Deut 6-9. There are other commands of God to slaughter whole peoples which make one's blood curdle. The reasonable explanation of these verses is that God never uttered them.

The laws promulgated by God through Moses are not merciful, as stated above. But Jesus says "Think not that I come to destroy the law or the prophets; I came not to destroy but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you till heaven and earth pass one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled". 5 Mat. 17, 18. But what does he mean by saying in 16 L. 16 "the law and prophets were until John, since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth unto it," and in the next verse saying "that it is easier for heaven and earth to pass than one tittle of the law to fail." Jesus is very fond of saying that the heaven and earth will pass before any of his sayings is found incorrect. He says he will come back after his death at the time of the resurrection during the lifetime of his generation and ends by saying that "heaven and earth shall pass away but my words shall not pass away." 17 Mk. 28, 24 Mat. 34, 35, 13 Mk. 30, 31, 21 L. 32, 33. Now we know that

the prophecy of Jesus in both instances has been falsified by the event. He has not yet come and the law of retaliation and other laws enumerated in the Pentateuch are not in force in any community of Jews and they are not in possession of the land of Canaan and all land up to the Nile promised by God to Abraham and Isaac and to their seed for ever. 13 Gen. 15, 15 Gen. 18, 17 Gen. 7-12, and before the Great war there were barely 100,000 Jews in all Palestine, the majority of the people being Mahomedans, who before the War ruled the patrimony of Abraham, and even now a Mahomedan chief is the king of Palestine. Notwithstanding the severity of the Mosaic law, and the nonfulfilment of God's promises, Jesus was an ardent follower of the law though he was not a Pharisee. He made pilgrimages to Jerusalem on every passover feast, ate the paschal lamb, and we find him ordering the leper whom he had cured to "show thyself to the priest, and offer the gift that Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them." 8 Mat. 4, 1 Mk. 44, 5 L. 14. Jesus also preached in the synagogues 1 Mk. 39, 4 L. 15.

I do not wish to mention all the other sayings of Jesus. I intend to confine myself to some of his more important sayings, and the next matter to which I wish to draw the reader's attention is what Jesus spoke of himself. He called himself the son of man, and the son of God. These words may be applied to any man though Jesus might have used them in an ambiguous sense, otherwise why does he use these platitudes? But the words son of God had a hidden meaning, and he was charged with blasphemy by the High Priest for claiming to be the son of God and declared fit to die. (26 Mat. 63-5). And he extolled Peter for calling him the son of God and promised

to give him the keys of heaven, 16 Mat. 15-19, though immediately after, the Bible narrative states that when Jesus said he would suffer much from the elders and the chief priest and then be put to death, and Peter said that this be far from Jesus, the latter turned and said unto Peter, get thee behind me, Satan, thou art an offence unto me 16 Mat. 21-23. 8 Mk. 31-33.

The sayings of Christ regarding himself are many. The reader will find them in Appendix II containing an abstract of the Bible narrative. Here I shall quote the principal ones which will show what Jesus claimed to be, premising that John gives the greatest number of these sayings.

9 Mat. 6 "I have power to forgive sins."

11 Mat. 27, 2 Mk.10, 5 Luke 24, 10 John 15. "All things are delivered by God to me and we only know one another, besides those to whom I will reveal him.

12 Mat. 6, 8, 41-42, 2 Mk. 28 "I am greater than the temple and lord of the sabbath."

18 Mat. 11 "I have come to save."

26 Mat. 64, 22 Luke 70, 9 John 35-38, 10 John 36, 17 John 1 "I am the son of God."

3 John 13 "I alone ascended heaven."

5 John 19 "I do what God does."

5 John 22, 27 "All judgments are committed to me and I have authority to execute them."

6 John 47 "Believer on me hath everlasting life."

6 John 48, 51 "I am the bread of life."

„ "Eaters of my flesh and drinkers of my blood have eterna llife."

8 John 12, 9 John 5, 12 John 46 "I am the light of the world."

8 John 23 "I am from above, ye are from beneath."

" 38 "I speak what I have seen with my Father."

" 54 "My Father honoureth me."

" 58 "Before Abraham was I am."

10 John 9 "I am the door."

" 30, 36 "I and my Father are one," but when his hearers threatened to stone him for this blasphemy, he climbed down and said he meant to say that "he was the son of God."

11 John 25 "I am the resurrection and the life."

" 36 "I am the son of God."

" 45 "Those who see me see God."

14 John 6 "I am the true way, the truth and the life, no one cometh unto the Father but by me."

24 "My words are my Father's."

15 John 1 "I am the true vine."

16 John 15 "All things that the Father hath are mine."

17 John 2 "Power over all flesh has been given to me."

24 "Thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world."

25 "Father, the world hath not known thee but I have known thee."

24 Mat. 29-35, 13 Mk. 24-31, 21 Luke 25-33.

When the world will be destroyed Jesus will come in the clouds and judge mankind.

From the above sayings one can perceive that Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels does not claim any higher power than to forgive sins and to save and that he and God know one another. This power to

save is not a very great thing as many Brahmins and Sanyasis claim this power and it is the claim to this power to forgive sins and thus to save, asserted by Pope Leo X and those to whom he delegated this power, and who sold the indulgences, which was the prime cause of the Reformation. The claim to know God is asserted by many Hindus, particularly Brahmins who assert that a knowledge of God can be obtained by knowledge, faith, or works, and I believe all devout men claim to know God more or less. So there is nothing extraordinary in these claims. But John has put in the mouth of Jesus several claims which will raise him far above the level of any human being, and in one place he claims an equality, nay unity with God, when he says "I and my Father are one," 10 J. 30 after which when his hearers threatened to stone him for this blasphemy, he climbed down to saying "I am the Son of God," 10 John 36, saying he meant to say the latter when he uttered the former saying. The argument by which he converted the first saying into meaning the latter, from unity to separate individuality is very specious and I believe no one can follow this argument. Rev. Dr. K. S. MacDonald cites the first saying but omits the latter, but the two sayings ought to be read together. Papers on the Bible p 303. I find an inconsistency here. Here Jesus says I and my Father are one, but in 14 John 28 he says "my Father is greater than I." How can two identical beings be greater or less than one another? This passes my comprehension, and how can this admission that God is greater than Jesus be reconciled with the doctrine of Trinity which makes the three godheads equal and consubstantial?

In the Fourth Gospel Jesus is made to extol himself. He says that he had glory with God before the world was, and that God loved him before the foundation of the world (17 John 5, 24). He also says "as the Father knoweth me, even so I know the Father" (10 John 15). Both Matthew and Luke make him say that "all things have been delivered unto me of my Father : and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father ; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him" (11 Mat. 27, 10 Luke 22). In 9 Matthew 6, 2 Mark 10, 5 Luke 24 he says that "the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins." In other places he says "And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from, heaven even the Son of man which is in heaven" (3 John 13), "For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." (6 John 38). "Not that any man hath seen the Father, save he which is of God, he hath seen the Father," (6 John 46) "I speak that which I have seen with my Father : and ye do that which ye have seen with your father" (8 John 38), "But I know him : for I am from him, and he hath sent me", (7 John 29) "And he said unto them, ye are from beneath ; I am from above : ye are of this world ; I am not of this world." (8 John 23), "If God were your Father, ye would love me : for I proceeded forth and came from God ; neither came I of myself, but he sent me (8 John 42), "Ye both know me, and ye know whence I am : and I am not come of myself, but he that sent me is true, whom ye know not (7 John 28).

Now I wish to draw the reader's attention to some of his other sayings. He promised everlasting life

to his believers. 19 Mat. 29, 3 John 18, 36, 4 John 36, 5 John 24, 29, 6 John 35, 40, 47, 51, 54, 10 John 16, 36, 17 J. 3. and the non-believers were to go to hell and there suffer from everlasting fire, 13 Mt. 42, 50, 25 Mt. 41, 46, 3 Mk. 29, 9 Mk. 43, 44, 16 Mk. 16, 3 John 18, 36, 5 John 29.

In connection with the above I ought to bring to the readers' notice two things stated in the Bible. The first is that when the world will be destroyed Jesus will come in the clouds and sit on the right hand of Power and try mankind. 24 Mat. 29-30, 31 Mat. 31-46, 26 Mat. 64, 8 Mk. 38, 13 Mk. 24-27, 14 Mk. 62, 21 Luke 27. The second is that when angels will gather the people, the elect will be placed on the right hand of Jesus and the non-elect on the left. Jesus does not say who the elect and the non-elect are and why the one will be saved and the other condemned. Has predestination anything to do with this selection? Jesus does not say anything about predestination but the apostles Peter and Paul support this doctrine. 8 Rom. 29, 2 Eph. 10, 1 (1 Pet.) 1. It may be that Jesus meant to say that those who have faith in him will be the elect, as he lays great stress on faith, so much so that he says that faith can remove mountains and give what is desired by the faithful. 17 Mat. 20, 21, 21 Mat. 21, 11 Mk. 23, 24, 17 Luke 6. The apostles have quarrelled as to the power of faith. Paul is the greatest advocate of faith and defines it in 11 Heb 1 "Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." James says one must have both faith and prayer and goes even to say that "faith without works is dead," 2 James 20, 26.

The verses regarding justification by faith are mostly found in Paul's epistles. They are : -I Rom.

17, 2 Rom. 31, 32. 9 Rom. 31, 32. 11 Rom. 5, 6. 14 Rom. 23. 2 Gal. 21. 5 Gal. 11. and 5 James 14, 15 say that prayer of faith cures sickness. The verses which speak of man's justification by works are 7 Mat. 24, 16 Mat. 27, 2 Rom. 13 (contra v. 20) 28, 11 Rom. 6, 6 Gal. 7, 3 Tit. 5, where Paul speaks of grace 2 John 14, 17, 20, 24, 26, 20 Rev. 13, 22 Rev. 12. Jesus is silent on this matter. He merely says that faith can remove mountains and give what is desired, 17 Mat. 20. 21, 21 Mat. 21 11 Mk. 23, 24, 12 Mk. 23. 17 Luke 6. 13 (1 Cor.) 2.

Jesus taught that the kingdom of heaven was at hand. 3 Mat. 1, 4 Mat. 17, 24 Mat. 17, 8 Mat. 11, 10 Mat. 7, 5 John 25, but what it is, he nowhere explains but it appears that in heaven there is a very big palace, perhaps as vast as the preserved table of the Koran, for he says that "in my father's house there are many mansions if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you." 14 John 2.

As to what the kingdom of Christ is we are left in the dark. Pilate asked Jesus, "art thou a king then? His reply was "thou sayest that I am a king, and I come to bear witness unto the truth and my kingdom if not of the world." 18 John 36, 37, but the Synoptic gospels say that Jesus admitted that he was king of the Jews 27 Mat. 11, 15 Mk. 2, 23 Luke 3. To the apostles he had said that he "shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." 19 Mat. 28, 22 Luke 29. In 22 Luke 30 Jesus said that the apostles "will eat and drink at my table in my kingdom." So it appears that in the next world men will be able to eat and drink, just as we do here, as after resurrection every one will get back his corporeal body. His

apostles and others believed that the kingdom would be a temporal one and that he would restore "again the kingdom of Israel." 24 L. 21, 1 Acts 6.

He says "I came not to send peace but a sword" 10. Mat. 34 and "I come to cast fire upon the earth" (12 Luke 49). He meant to say that he came to set at variance parents and children and one man against another. This is too true. Every religious teacher kindles a fire in society. Some become their followers and others become the enemies of their followers and eventually the two parties quarrel and sometimes kill one another. At first Christians were killed by the Pagans. Nero put to death thousands of Christians. Pliny the Younger wrote to Trajan as to how to conduct himself towards them and the result was the death of several Christians. Even under that noblest of Emperors, Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, whom the Christians call the greatest of Pagans, the Christians were persecuted and many put to death at Vienne and other places. After the spread of Christianity in Europe we find one sect of Christians killing another sect. Many thousands lost their lives in the suppression of the Albigenian heresy. The Inquisition caused untold sufferings by means of the rack and the burning of heretics. Even in the nineteenth century a heretic was burnt to death in Mexico. Vide Gore's *Scientific Basis of Morality* p. 426. It is well known what the Crusaders did to the Saracens and what the Saracens did to spread the religion of Mahomed. Northern Africa and Asia to the west of the Euphrates, and Turkey were parts of the Roman Empire and became converted to Christianity soon after Constantine made it the state religion of the Roman Empire. Persia had its own religion. Countries to the east of

Persia followed the Buddhist faith. To-day we find all these countries following the Mahomedan faith. Even India has a large Mahomedan population. Did the people of these countries willingly give up their ancestral faith or were forced by the Saracens to adopt the Mahomedan religion? Other examples need not be cited. So Christ is perfectly correct in saying that he came to send a sword.

Now let us see what Jesus said about the Last Day, the resurrection, and the judgment of mankind. I have already said that Jesus does not say anything about the lower animals. As regards the Last Day he says that there will be great tribulation on earth after the gospel has been preached to all nations, when the end will come, 24 Mat. 1-31, 13 Mark 10, 7-23, 21 L. 5-25 and the temple will be destroyed, and there will be wars when the Jews will be led away captive, there will be earthquakes, famines and pestilence, and there will be no sign of the sun, moon and stars which last will fall (24 Mat. 29, 13 Mark 24-25, 21 Luke 25) "and then the Son of Man (i. e. Jesus) will come in the clouds of heaven with power and glory with his angels who will with trumpet sound gather the elect from the four winds," 24 Mat. 30-31, 13 Mark 27, 21 Luke 27 After stating these facts in almost identical terms all the three synoptic gospels introduce the parable of the fig tree also in the same words and then make Jesus say that "this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled. Heaven and earth shall pass away but my words shall not pass away." 24 Mat. 34-35, 13 Mark 30-31, 21 Luke 32-33. Mark and Luke are silent as to what will take place after the elect are gathered, but Matthew (Ch. 25 verses 31-46) gives an abstract of the trial and the judgment which Jesus

will pass. Matthew says that the Son of Man will come in his glory with his holy angels and sit upon the throne of his glory, and when all nations are gathered before him, he will separate them into two parties, the elect on his right side and the non-elect on his left, and after saying that the elect gave him or his brethren food, drink and clothing when they needed he will tell them to "inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. 25 Mat. 34 and to those on the left he will say "depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels" 25 Mat. 41, the reason of this terrible punishment being that "they gave no food or drink to Jesus when he required them, when he was a stranger they did not take him in, naked, they clothed him not, sick or in prison, they visited him not. 25 Mat. 42-43 "and these will go away into everlasting punishment but the righteous into life eternal." V. 46.

Christ promised to come during the lifetime of the present generation. Did Christ come back in the clouds of heaven during the lifetime of his generation? Nineteen hundred years have elapsed since these words were uttered by Jesus. Has he ever appeared to any man since he ascended heaven except to St. Paul and to St. John in two visions? All these things happened in the first century A. D. and during the last 1800 years no human being had the good fortune to see Jesus. And Jesus was very emphatic in this matter. "Verily, I say unto you, this generation shall not pass till all those things be fulfilled. Heaven and earth shall pass away but my words shall not pass away," 24 Mat. 34, 35, 13 Mk. 30-31, 21 L. 32-33, 16 Mat. 28, 9 Mk. 1, 9 L. 27. Has there been a similar boast by any person? The whole universe will be

destroyed but his prophecies cannot be false. And we find that this prophecy is false and the universe still exists.

In 21 L. 20 Jesus says that "when ye shall see Jerusalem encompassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh." Jerusalem was many times encompassed with armies after these words were spoken. It was encompassed in the time of Vespasian, captured and destroyed. The Crusaders encompassed it with armies and took it and Saladin did likewise and recaptured it long after. Less than a dozen years ago the allies encompassed it with armies and captured it. But the desolation never came and is not expected to come soon. Not one of the prophetic sayings of Christ has been yet fulfilled, though the time of their fulfilment has long ago passed by.

I wish to make some comments upon the Last Day, the resurrection, trial and condemnation of the guilty narrated in the preceding paragraph. In the first place 24 Mat. 13 Mark and 21 Luke, are almost word for word the same and the sequence and wording of the verses are almost the same. It appears as if they were all copied from one original. The original New Testament was not divided into chapters and verses, which have been introduced into it by the translators. Now 24 Mat. 1-9-13 Mark 1-9, 24 Mat. 13-14-13 Mark 9-10, 24 Mat. 15-25-13 Mark 14-13, 24 Mat. 29-36-13 Mark 24-32 and 13 Mark 5.

Then the wars of the Jews with the Romans and the destruction of the temple (in the time of Vespasian in A. D. 70) are narrated in the three gospels in almost identical terms, which leads one to suppose that the narrators have copied from one original in identical terms the description of contemporary events.

As the gospels were written after 70 A. D. when most of these calamities of the Jews had occurred and the description is in identical terms and the sequence and the wording of narration are also identical, we must come to the conclusion that these were not the words of Jesus but of some other narrator who wrote the original text after A. D. 70, after these so called prophetic events had been fulfilled.

We have next to observe that on the last day, the sun and moon will not give any light and the stars will fall. If astronomers are to be believed then it will take millions of years for the sun to be an extinct luminary, and the words "the stars shall fall from heaven" are meaningless, as the 'stars' which fall from heaven are not stars but meteorites which become incandescent when they come into contact with the earth's atmosphere which kindles them on account of the great friction caused by the rapid motion of the meteors. This shews that Jesus confounded the falling stars or meteors with the real stars some of which, such as Betelgeuse, are more than fifty million times bigger than the sun which is fourteen million times bigger than the earth. And this ignorant Jesus is called the equal partner with God and the Saviour of mankind. The real fact is that Jesus never said these things but they have been put into his mouth long after his death by the author of the original text from whom the authors of the synoptic gospels have copied verbatim. The falling of the stars and the darkening of the sun and moon are taken from 13 Isai and 10 and 34 Isai 4 and it seems that some forger has put these words into the mouth of Jesus.

It seems that in olden times stars used to fall on earth. Jesus says that on the last day the stars will

fall from heaven. Of course the stars were then supposed to be very small bodies, and if all the visible stars were to fall on earth, it would not materially suffer, but modern astronomers say that the sun which is fourteen million times bigger than the earth is one of the smallest stars, and they cannot imagine how the stars will fall on earth. Further, in ancient times the belief was that of all visible bodies the earth was the biggest. Ward, in his *Literature of the Hindus*, says that Hindu astronomers believed that the sun was smaller than the moon, in the proportion of 59 to 60, and they were not very distant from the earth. As stated in a previous paragraph the monkey god Hanuman, before he was a day old, jumped towards the sun, thinking it was a luscious fruit, and fell upon it. So it must have been very close to the earth. Vide Valmiki's *Ramayana* Canto 7 chapter 35. The saying of Jesus refers to a future time, but St. John in 6 Rev. 13, and 9 Rev. 1 says he actually saw stars fall on earth on two occasions. He was not sleeping or dreaming, but was wide awake when he saw the stars fall. We would now say that a meteor fell.

We next find that "the Son of man (meaning Christ himself) will come in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory" 24 Mat. 30. What is meant by "clouds of heaven" and what is meant by coming in the clouds of heaven I fail to understand. Then the angels will be sent with sound of trumpet to gather all nations. 25 Mat. 32. Are these people all living at the time or they include also the dead? Jesus is silent as to the resurrection of the dead. Now can a man be resurrected in his corporeal frame if his parts have been separated before his death or even after his death. Many persons were hanged, drawn

and quartered in England, and many men were devoured by beasts or cannibals. How can their parts be joined at the time of resurrection, and if they had been reduced to ashes by burning, or to dust in the ground how can they get back their bodies? It is said that Jesus rose from the grave. Let it be so. But he had his body entire and the holes in his hands and feet still existed when he appeared before the apostles, and his body was otherwise so perfect that he had to ask for food and he ate some fishes. His body was entire when put into the grave and he rose after two days with his body entire. But every corpse is not entire, and every man is not buried for only two days. What will become of people whose bodies have been burnt or reduced to dust in the grave? Christians ought to think over this matter, and if some corpses cannot be made entire at the time of resurrection how will they appear before Christ on the Last Day, and if condemned to everlasting fire (25 Mat. 41-46) how will this fire affect their incorporeal bodies? These are very difficult questions, and Christians and Moslems ought to find an answer for them, as they all believe in everlasting hell fire. Koran Ch. 4 V. 59, Ch. 7 V. 34 etc., and 25 Mat. 41, 46.

Then the assembled nations will be divided into two groups, the elect and the non-elect. Who will elect the elected and on what ground? The Bible is silent upon this point. However it appears from 25 Mat. that the elect gave meat to Jesus "when he was hungry and drink when he was thirsty, and when he was a stranger he was taken in, naked, and he was clothed, and visited when he was sick or in prison. 25 Mat. 35-37, and when the elect would say when have we done this, the answer of Jesus will be that in as much as ye have done it to one

of these my brethren ye have done it unto me " 25 Mat. 40. The non-elect are those who never did these things to even the least person. 25 Mat. 42-45. The words "these my brethren" probably refer to the present generation and not to persons who died before the advent of Jesus." Now what will become of the latter? The Bible is silent regarding the salvation or condemnation of persons who died before Jesus took his birth or commenced his mission. That appears also from 16 Mark 16 which says, "he that believeth and is baptised shall be saved but he that believeth not shall be damned (or condemned according to the new Version). So the Bible gives us no idea of or clue to the fate of the persons who died before the advent of Christ. The Mahomedan religion also is silent upon this point. It saves Mahomedans and condemns non-Mahomedans, but how could a man be a Mahomedan and save himself before Mahomed's birth?

He says there will be signs in the sun, moon and stars and distress on earth, and then "the Son of man will come in a cloud with great glory, and all this will happen in the present generation" and he ends by a bombastic saying "heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." Strictly speaking this was the most important prophecy of Christ, as it raised the expectation of his second advent. Even Paul expected this second advent in his life time. 4 (1 Thess) 16-17. The other prophecies in the New Testament are of very little importance. Religion is necessary only for salvation. If man knew that there is no hereafter he would have done away with religion altogether. He would enjoy this present life to his heart's content, not caring for the joys or sorrows of

others, whose joys or sorrows would not affect him. It is only the hope of the existence of a future state and the fear of punishment in the next world that make man follow some religion or other. Therefore the nature of the rewards and punishments in the next world is the most important thing in all religions. Here Christ held out very strong hopes to his followers, of an imminent end of the world, and a reward for all eternity to the believers, and eternal damnation for the non-believers. And all this was to have happened within his generation. So he has disappointed his generation and his followers were grievously disappointed. In the whole history of the record of human hopes and aspirations has there been a greater disappointment? I believe not. If Jesus knew that he was holding out false hopes, he acted very improperly. But the more charitable view is that he believed that all this would happen, and his expectation has not been fulfilled. In this matter I am inclined to the opinion that these things were never uttered by Jesus but have been put into his mouth long after his death in 29 A. D. and sometime after the Jewish wars with the Romans and the destruction of the Temple in A. D. 70. I can never believe that Jesus after making this prophecy should have said that "heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away, 24 Mat. 35, 13 Mk. 31 21 L. 33. Has there been a greater boast recorded in any history? I doubt it. Therefore I stick to my opinion that these words are interpolations. Otherwise they would have lowered Jesus in the estimation of all men.

Then about wars, famines and pestilence spoken of by Jesus as events just preceeding his second advent, what are the facts? He refers to these events

happening every where, and among all nations, whereas we find that the Jewish wars which took place after Jesus happened during the reign of Vespasian forty years after the death of Jesus and were confined to the Jews and "Nation have risen against nation" and "kingdom against kingdom" and there have been "famines" "pestilence and earthquakes" on many occasions since these words were spoken and "Jerusalem was encompassed with armies" but Jesus never appeared on any of these occasions. Even during the last Great War of Nations we never heard of the advent of Jesus. So this, the boldest of prophecies, has not come to pass and I hope will never come to pass.

Now I wish to make a few observations upon the doctrines of election. Now what is meant by the "elect" who will be saved and the non-elect who will get the benefit of everlasting hell fire. Jesus gives a clue to the basis of the division of men into the elect and the non-elect. The former are those who gave food, drink, clothing to needy people and visited the sick bed and the prison room. 25 Mat. 35-40. The non-elect are those who did none of these things 25 Mat. 41-46. Now to be entitled to go to heaven for doing acts of charity is no doubt a good idea, but the charitable man may have many vices which out-balance his charity. In short to send a man to heaven merely because he is a charitable person though he may be a most vicious and cruel man in other respects is not a good idea. Take one or two concrete instances. Tamerlane erected a pyramid of 90,000 human heads. Suppose he was charitably disposed to the poor, which probably he was as the Koran enjoins charity to the poor and makes it a cardinal virtue. Is he to be one

of the elect? Conversely if baptism and belief in Christ be the deciding factors in qualifying a person to be saved according to 16 mark 16 then the famous Bloody Mary of England is sure to be saved as she was baptised and was a devout believer in Christ's godhead. The perpetrators of the Massacre of Bartholomew will also be saved for the very same reason, as well as all the leaders of the Inquisition. But human imagination revolts at such an idea, and such doctrines can never be regarded as good. What will be fallen to a person who is not a Christian nor a charitable person, but very good in other respects? He may be a man who injures nobody. Jesus is silent upon this point. According to 25 Mat. 34-41 only the charitable is to go to heaven and charity is the only deciding factor in the matter of a man being elect or non-elect. This view is too narrow. He should have said that the man who is charitable, kind, honest and who does not wilfully injure any man or beast, and people of that kind will be the elect.

Further there is an inconsistency in this doctrine of the elect who will be saved, and the believer in Christ who is baptised who will enjoy similar good fortune. In 16 Mark 16 Jesus says that "he that believeth and is baptised shall be saved but he that believeth not shall be damned." But if that man is not qualified to be an elect according to the saying of Christ in 25 Mat. 41-46 what will be his fate, as he cannot be saved according to the saying in Matthew but will he be saved according to 16 Mark 16? Conversely a non-believer, if he be a charitable person, will be saved according to 25 Mat. 34-40, but will be condemned according to 16 Mark 16. Could a man like Jesus utter such inconsistent say-

ings? I believe not. The authors of the Revised Version have doubted the authenticity of all the verses in 16 Mark after verse 8. Therefore the probability is that Jesus did not utter the words in 16 Mark 16.

As regards the judge who is to preside on the tribunal of the Last Day, I find there is an inconsistency. Jesus says he will say to the elect "come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world" 25 Mat. 34, and in 14 John 6 he says "no man cometh unto the Father but by me." These two sayings clearly show that Jesus will be the final judge of mankind. But in 14 Mat. 28 Jesus addressing the apostles said "When the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." One will naturally ask how will the twelve apostles judge any person on the Last Day when Jesus will be the presiding judge or will the Jews be excluded from trial by Jesus and be made over for trial to the twelve apostles? And then what will become of the judgment seat which Judas Iscariot would have occupied but for his treachery and suicide?

In the preceding pages I have stated his principal religious doctrines including what is to happen on the Last Day. These last he stated on his last visit to Jerusalem. On this occasion he sat at supper with the twelve apostles and instituted the Holy Supper, saying that the bread and wine which he blessed and gave them were his flesh and his blood, 26 Mat. 26-29, 14 Mark 22-25, 22 Luke 19-20. John omits this but says he washed their feet, 13 J. 1-20, but the other gospels are silent upon this point whereas John is silent as to the institution of the Holy Supper.

Now John was one of the company, and he says that Jesus leaned on his bosom at this supper, and when Jesus said he would be betrayed by one of them, Peter made a sign to him to ask Jesus who would do this, and on his asking Jesus he said it was he to whom he would give a sap after dipping it and he gave it to Judas. 13 John 23-26. I am in a difficulty here. Am I to believe the story of the institution of the Holy Supper when one of the company is totally silent upon this very important matter? In 6 John 51, 57 I find Jesus saying that those who eat his flesh and drink his blood will have eternal life and Jesus will raise him on the Last Day, but John is totally silent as to the Holy Supper, about the interpretation of which Roman Catholics and Protestants differ and which has caused the loss of millions of human lives. When instituting this Holy Supper Jesus said that the wine which he gave them to drink after he had blessed it was "my blood of the New Testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins" 26 Mat. 28. In 14 Mark 24 words are the same with the omission of the words "for the remission of sins," but Luke (Ch. 22 V. 20) omits the word many and substitutes "for you" and also omits what Mark omits. In the first place the genuineness of this portion of the gospel is very doubtful, and in the second place the words are meaningless, as how can one's sins be remitted by the blood of another person? As to the washing of the apostles' feet, I believe the narration and it was a very natural act of Jesus when he saw that Judas had left to betray him. After the institution of the Holy Supper Jesus said to his disciples "I appoint unto you a kingdom as my Father has appointed unto me, that ye

may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. 22 Luke 29. I have already commented on this passage and therefore pass it over, except to say that there will be eating and drinking in the next world, and drinking what, water or wine? As to the eating of Christ's flesh and drinking his blood, which all Catholics take in a literal sense what does it mean? If a man actually does this he is called a cannibal. The fact is that these words, if used at all, were used in a figurative sense. But all Christians took these words in a literal sense till the Reformation in the sixteenth century and Catholics still follow the old doctrine, and this is one of the real differences between these two sects.

Afterwards Jesus went to a place called Gethsemane and leaving the disciples behind, advanced a little and fell on his face and prayed to God saying "Father if thou be willing, remove this cup from me, nevertheless not my will but thine be done. 26 Mat. 39, 42, 14 Mark 35, 36, 22 Luke 42. This is a remarkable instance of perfect resignation to the will of God.

I have mentioned almost all the important sayings and doings of Christ, and shown that his sayings are very good moral lessons, but that his prophecies about his second advent and the last day have been falsified by the event. His parables I have praised, but his miracles I have doubted, and I have tried to explain them. I have shown that except in the doubtful passage in 10 J. 30, in the doubtful Gospel of John, where he is made to say "I and my Father are one" but which he subsequently retreats in verse 36, Jesus nowhere says that he is God, though in the same

Gospel he says "My Father is greater than I." 14 J. 28. All these have led me to the conclusion that Jesus is not God in any sense of the word. He was only a superman just as Buddha was, and whose disciples have since raised him almost to the level of God, but as Buddhists do not believe in God, Buddha could not be raised to that high position.

I am sorry I have been compelled to come to the conclusion that during his lifetime Jesus never treated the Jew and the Gentile alike, and his sayings after his resurrection I have shown to be apocryphal.

CHAPTER. 4.

HIS PARABLES

I have almost come to the end of the mission of Jesus Christ, and have mentioned his principal sayings excepting his wonderful parables, every one of which has a moral behind it. Different gospels have given different parables and only three of them are found in all the three synoptic gospels. They are about the Sower in 13 Mat. 3-23, 4 Mk. 3-20, 8 Luke 4-15, about the mustard seed in 13 Mat. 31-32, 4 Mk. 30-32, 13 Luke 18-19, and about the wicked vine dressers, 21 Mat. 33-41, 12 Mk. 1-9, 20 Luke 9-16. Two are found in two gospels only, the Leaven, 13 Mat. 33, 13 Luke 20-21, the lost sheep 18 Mat. 12, 14. 15 Luke 3-7. Eleven are found only in Matthew, two only in Mark, fifteen in Luke and only one in John Ch. 15 vs.1-8. Some of them relate to the progress of the kingdom of Christ, some to the moral requisites for entering the kingdom of Christ, some to the activity in the kingdom of Christ, some to forgiveness, some to the right use of worldly possessions, some to the Christian spirit and some to prayer. Some of these parables are for illustrating the meaning of Christ by an example, some, like that of the ten Virgins, compare things spiritual and temporal. It is difficult to say which out of these thirty four parables is the best. Perhaps the palm should be given to that of the prodigal son. However they are good in their way. It must not be understood that Jesus monopolised all parables or that his parables are the

best. The fables of Æsop are all parables and there are very good parables in the Mahabharata. Out of the 34 parables in the Bible John gives one only, about the vine, 15 J. 1-8.

CHAPTER. 5.

HIS MIRACLES.

So far I have not mentioned any miracle. Therefore it is now necessary that I should say something about them. The gospels narrate thirty-five miracles performed by Christ. If they have been truly narrated they are really wonderful and cannot be explained. There is only one miracle which is recorded in all the four gospels and that is about feeding five thousand with five loaves and two fishes. It is mentioned in 14 Mat. 15-21, 6 Mk. 35-44, 9 L. 12-17, 6 J. 5-14. Ten are mentioned in the three synoptic gospels and Jesus' walking on the sea is mentioned by Matthew Mark and John. Six are mentioned in two gospels, and seventeen in one gospel only. The most extraordinary of these miracles was the raising of Lazarus 11 J. 1-46 who had died and been buried four days, and whose sister Martha told Jesus that "he stinketh" v. 39 Jesus cried with a loud voice, "Lazarus come forth" v. 43. "And be that he was dead came forth bound hand and foot with grave clothes, and his face was bound about with a napkin v. 44. In the first place it is not believable that a man who had died four days ago and been buried and who was stinking should come out of the grave and in the second place it is difficult to understand how a man who was bound hand and foot with grave clothes could come out of the grave as his feet were bound. Stinking commenced after decomposition had set in, and perhaps John did not know that after death the stomach is partly destroyed by the bile.

How could his blood which had coagulated in the veins be moved by his heart beat? So this story cannot be believed. The raising to life of the daughter of Jairus mentioned in 9 Mat. 18-19, 23-26, 5 Mk. 22-24, 35-43, 8 L. 41-42, 49-56 was not an extraordinary event. Jesus himself said that she was not dead but was sleeping. The only other instance of raising a man who happened to be the only son of a widowed mother is narrated in 7 L. 11-16. Here also the man perhaps was not dead and therefore there is nothing extraordinary in the so-called raising him. Many miracles relate to the healing of the sick and there is nothing extraordinary in them. The miraculous draughts of fishes on two occasions are mentioned in 5 L. 1-11 and 21 J. 1-14. On both occasions Peter fails to catch any fish but when under Christ's direction he throws his net in a certain direction he got plenty of fishes. These also are not extraordinary events. The withering of the fig tree mentioned in 21 Mat. 17-22 and 11 Mk. 12-14, 20-24 is no doubt extraordinary. But the narrative shows that Jesus was not a good-tempered man. He was hungry and found no fig in the tree and therefore he cursed it saying "let no fruit grow on thee hence forward for ever. And presently the fig tree withered away." A tree might cease to bear fruit but it is not necessary that it should wither away. 21 Mat. When his disciples marvelled at this Jesus told them that "if ye have faith and doubt not ye shall not only do this which is done to the fig tree but as ye shall say unto this mountain be thou removed and be thou cast into the sea, it shall be done. And all things whatsoever ye ask in prayer, believeing, ye shall receive vs. 21-23. As to the withering of the fig tree, Mark is silent vide 12 Mk.

13-14. Mark says it was not the time for figs and therefore Jesus found none on the tree and only said "no man eat fruit of thee hereafter for ever." 11 Mk. 13-14. There was no curse and no withering of the tree which is an embellishment added by Matthew.

I do not attach much importance to the other miracles. Jesus' walking on the sea, 14 Mat 22-33. 6 Mark 45-52, and 6 J. 19-21 is no doubt difficult to explain, but I have heard in my younger days that a neighbour of mine could walk on the river and I have seen with mine own eyes my first cousin and another kinsman floating in the water on their backs like a dead body and remaining in this position for a length of time without moving their hands and legs. The latter once placed a copper plate on his chest while on his back in a tank in our village and placing the god Shiva on it performed its puja which lasted more than half an hour, and others besides myself were witnesses to it. Jesus is said to have turned water into wine, which is the first miracle performed by him (2 J. 1-11). I heard in my younger days that a Brahmin neighbour of mine could turn water into sugar. This man was regarded as an incarnation of Hari, he was called Hari Thakur, though his real name was Kalikumar and pilgrimages are still performed to his resting place though he died half a century ago. There remains to mention the casting out of the devil. When I was young many Hindus believed in evil spirits, and Ojhas, who exorcised them, were in demand, but since many years I do not hear of these spirits attacking any body. The fact is that with the advance of knowledge and education these evil spirits (called bhuts and prets in Bengali) have receded to the

jungles, and now live among the ignorant Hindus. They have I believe fled from Europe and other Christian countries, but were very numerous in Christ's time and long after. The miracle about the driving away the demons from two persons who were attacked by them related in 8 Mat. 28-34, 5 Mark 1-20, and 8 L. 26-39 is very peculiar. The devils asked Jesus' permission to enter a herd of swine numbering two thousand (5 Mark 13) which was feeding close by. Jesus gave permission and they entered the herd which ran into the sea and were all drowned. Perhaps this favour was shewn to the devils because they called him the Son of God for the first time in the Bible. I am sorry that Jesus caused the deaths of so many innocent beasts. But perhaps the explanation is that they were very unclean to the Jews, and Jesus had no sympathy for these unclean beasts. If such a story be related by any one as happening in this year of grace 1928, people would laugh at him, but because it is related in three synoptic gospels, Christians expect every body to believe this story. Thousands of miracles are mentioned in the religious books of the Hindus. A certain Muni called Jahnu swallowed up all the waters of the ocean, the god Hanuman immediately after his birth gave a tremendous leap towards the sun and fell upon it. These and other stories are related in Hindu religious books. What is the difference between these stories and the devils entering the swine which caused their drowning. The fact is anciently men were very credulous and had very little critical spirit, and believed every story they heard from others.

We have all seen magicians do wonderful things. They produce many articles of food from their small

bag, produce many coins from their empty hands and hundreds of yards of thread from their mouth and do other wonderful things which we cannot explain. These are not miracles to-day but two thousand years ago they were regarded as miracles.

Christ healed several persons. Scientific medicine was founded by Greece five centuries before it was unknown to the Jews, who were so opposed to all Greek learning that they compared a man who was learned in Greek to a dog. The contemporaries of Jesus believed, as savages still believe, that religious practices cured all illness, which was the result of a sin committed or the work of a demon, and not due to physical causes, and thus the holy man or the priest, who dealt with the supernatural, could cure the disease. Even in this year of grace, orthodox Hindus believe in the efficacy of religious practices in curing disease and their priests reap a rich harvest in consequence of this belief. Among the ancients and primitive people it was necessary that the priest or medium man should be present before his patient, and in some cases should touch him. The Hindus have gone one step further. The priest, being a Brahmin, cannot always touch the patient who may be of very inferior rank, he therefore performs a *puja* (religious ceremony) in absenti, even at a great distance, and he will get his perquisite, and send sandal paste and two or three flowers and *bæl* leaves, which must be placed on the patient's head. The Jews were in the same state of mind as modern Hindus are, and instances have been known of strange cures, really due to psychological causes, but ascribed to the power of the superman or the healing man or the god worshipped by the priest. In any case this curer

cannot be called the incarnation of the Deity, as Jesus is called.

As to the healing of the sick, there might be something extraordinary in these cures, but they may be faith cures, which are performed every day and all sorts of people go to Lourdes and many of them get cured of many diseases, and in India devout Hindus go to all sorts of temples for getting cures and many of them are cured. Dr. Frederick Anton Mesmer could stop bleeding by holding his hand over a wound. He cured Dr. Osherwald of paralysis and Professor Baur of blindness. His method of treatment was called mesmerism, now called Psychotherapy, hypnotism or faith cure. Pyrrhus of Epirus cured colic and liver congestions by a mere imposition of hands and feet. The Roman emperors Vespasian as stated by Tacitus, Hist. Bk. 4 and emperor Hadrian cured blindness by the same means and so did St. Patrick. The kings of France and England cured obstinate swellings by touch. Edward the Confessor first practised it. Dr. Johnson was touched by Queen Anne for his scrofula. Thousands of instances of marvellous cures can be cited but no one thinks of calling them miracles and the curer is not called a God.

The feeding of four or five thousand people with five loaves and two fishes is extraordinary. But are we bound to believe this story? The Mahabharata says that sixty thousand Munis came to Yudhistira and demanded food. This was after Yudhistira and the other members of his family had taken their meals. His wife Droupadi found a particle of food in the cooking pot, remembered the name of Krishna and immediately there was plenty of rice for the

whole sixty thousand. If we believe the gospel narrative, why should we reject the other narrative? The best way is to reject both.

As already stated the raising of Lazarus from the grave after four days burial is the most extraordinary miracle of Jesus, and Spinoza, the Jewish founder of modern Pantheism, once said that if he could persuade himself to believe the raising of Lazarus he would embrace Christianity. I do not agree with Spinoza, because among other reasons it was the duty of Christ to have taught men the means of raising the dead, and others beside Jesus are reported in the Bible to have raised the dead, but those who performed these miracles are not included in the godhead. I shall give an instance from each Testament. In 17 (1 Kings) 22 I find that on Elijah's prayer God revived the dead son of a widow, and in 9 Acts 36-42 we find that Peter prayed for the resurrection of Tabitha who was dead, and said "Tabitha arise" and she sat up. So raising of the dead and resurrection were not extraordinary events in those days. The ecclesiastical writers affirm that there were many raisings of the dead by Christian saints after Peter raised Tabitha from the dead. I reserve here my remarks about the resurrection of Jesus Christ for discussion after I come to narrate that event. It should be remarked that the synoptic gospels are silent as to the story of the raising of Lazarus which is found only in 11 John 1-46, and this beloved disciple or somebody on his behalf must have invented this story.

Excepting the raising of Lazarus and Jairus' daughter and the widow's son, there is nothing stranger than what occurred in the valley of Ajalon (10 Josh.

12-14) when Joshua was ordered to make the sun stand still an entire day upon Gideon and the moon in the valley of Ajalon, to enable the Jews, for whom God fought, to take vengeance upon the Amorites. On another occasion Isaiah brought the dial of the sun ten degrees backward 20 (2 Kings) 11, 38 Isaiah 8. I think these interferences with the motions of the sun and moon, upon the regular movements of which depends the whole planetary system are greater miracles than the raising of Lazarus. Still godhead is not attributed to Joshua or Isaiah.

It is argued by Paley that Porphyry, Celsus and the Emperor Julian admitted the authenticity and genuineness of the gospels, though they were the bitterest enemies of Christianity in the earlier centuries. As to Porphyry and Celsus their works have been destroyed by the monks and ecclesiastics who formerly monopolised learning and there is not extant a single copy of these books. But conceding that they did not challenge the authenticity of the miracles, what does that prove? As already stated the ancients were very credulous and orthodox Hindus are still very credulous. They still believe that every event, however extraordinary, which is narrated in their religious books is true. Julian became a pagan after abjuring Christianity. Did he not believe in all the miracles performed by the Greek and Roman gods and Greek heroes? Believing in miracles himself how could he be expected to disbelieve Christ's miracles?

I do not wish to enter into the question of the probability or possibility of miracles? This is a question rather of Philosophy, and it is impossible to prove or disprove either the probability or possibility of

miracles. Hume considered that he had succeeded in proving that miracles cannot take place, as the laws of nature are unalterable. But a great scientist like Alfred Russel Wallace is of a different opinion. He has tried by his essay on Miracles and Modern Spiritualism to prove that miracles can take place and has tried to upset the conclusions elaborated in Hume's celebrated Essay on Miracles. In my view, this question is more or less academic and everything depends upon the definition of the word miracle. If it means a deviation from the regular course of nature then it may happen only if God wills it. For instance the standing still for a whole day of the sun and moon in Gideon and the Valley of Ajalon is perfectly intelligible if God willed it as stated in 10 Josh 12-14. It may be objected to this by an astronomer that this militates against the first law of Newton, or other laws of motion, as motion is never stopped until there is a counter motion opposing it, but the answer would be that God can temporarily suspend the laws of motion, and everybody including Christians and Mahomedans will admit "that with God nothing is impossible." I am willing to admit that if God so wills it, one and one will henceforth make three and not two. But the question is did God will to alter the established course of nature on any particular occasion. The record of human beliefs shows that man formerly believed almost everything, however extraordinary it may be. All the miracles occurred at that time. Since the death of Christ no man has been revived after decomposition of his body had set in four days previously. In India too, the home of all strange beliefs, there is scarcely the record of a miracle within three or four centuries. Therefore we see that as men

progress intellectually and become scientific and believe in the orderly course of nature, the lesser becomes the number of miracles in every country. No doubt we even now hear of miraculous cures, but no one ascribes divinity to the curer. The thing is regarded as strange, and the cures are attributed to some unknown laws of nature, and no one thinks that God has intervened and altered the laws of nature to bring about the cures or other so-called miraculous events. Bibhishan, the brother of Ravana floated in the air with his companions and came to Rama to render him assistance in recovering his wife Seeta. This is the version of Valmiki, the author of the Ramayana. But we have seen many men floating in the air and coming from Europe to India. But we do not consider these feats as miraculous as Valmiki did. Why have miracles almost vanished from the earth ? Has God ceased to interfere with the course of nature ? Instead of assisting people in performing these petty miracles God should have assisted Christian changing the nature of man for the good of humanity and of all other living beings. In particular he should have assisted Christ, his beloved Son, and a part of his godhead in changing the first law of action in this world viz., Might is Right, that the stronger must devour or otherwise oppress the weaker. Until that is done let no man believe in miracles, which up to now have done no good to humanity at large, and to all sentient creatures.

In the tenth chapter of his work *An Inquiry concerning Human Understanding*, Hume treats of miracles. He defines a miracle in two places : (1) "a miracle is a violation of the laws of nature", (2) "a miracle is a transgression of the law of nature by a particular

volition of the Diety or by the interposition of some invisible agent." Wallace defines it thus: "Any act or event necessarily implying the existence and agency of superhuman intelligence," p. 5. He says that St. Francis D' Assisi and Ignatius rose in the air, painless operations were performed in a state produced by passes of the hand, a visit to the tomb of Abbe' Paris effected many extraordinary cures such as of cancer of the breast of a lady with destruction of the nipple. He cites several instances of people deriding many proposed inventions and discoveries, such as Franklins' invention of the lightning conductor, Young's undulatory theory, Gray's project of a rail road, Davy's project of lighting London with gas, Arago's discovery of the electric telegraph, Galileo's discovery of the satellites of Jupiter on the ground that the planets could not exceed the perfect number seven. Wallace is angry with Leckey for saying that "miracles cease when men cease to believe and expect them." Wallace bases his belief in Miracles and Spiritualism on the existence of invisible intelligences who perform them such as the rattling of furniture, the rising of tables in the air and the moving of other heavy bodies without any visible cause. He says (p. 102) that "under certain conditions a disembodied spirit is able to form for itself a visible body out of the emanation from living bodies in a proper magnetic relation to itself, and under still more favourable conditions this body can be made tangible. Thus all the phenomena of "mediumship take place," Miss Kate Fox of New York was the first medium in modern times, the discovery of her extraordinary powers taking place in March 1848, when she was only nine years old.

No doubt many facts related by Wallace are extra-

ordinary. The conjurors' tricks are also extraordinary, which no one, not in the secret, can explain. The rope trick practised in India by professional conjurors is also very difficult to explain. A ball of thread is thrown up towards the sky, the thread remains suspended in the sky, a man climbs up this thread, he fights with Indra, the chief god of the Vedas, his limbs begin to fall one by one and when all the parts of the body fall to the ground they are collected and covered up, the man is called by name and he appears from behind the crowd of spectators. Patanjala goes one step further. He is the founder of one of the six systems of Hindu Philosophy. In his work Patanjala Darshana or Philosophy of Patanjali, Ch.3 he mentions many wonderful things which will happen to a man if he can perform Yoga, or intense concentration of mind. In sutra (aphorism) 21 he says that a man can vanish out of sight, obtain the strength of an elephant (sutra 25), get a knowledge of bhuvana (universe) if he concentrates his mind on the sun (sutra 27) of the arrangement of the stars in the heavens by concentrating on the moon, (sutra 28) their motions by concentrating on the polar star, (sutra 29) the arrangements of the body by concentrating on the navel (sutra 30), he can do all this by pratibha or superior intelligence (sutra 34) he can get the knowledge of the soul (sutra 36), he can enter the body of another person (sutra 39) and do many other wonderful things too tedious to relate. If a man can vanish out of sight or enter the body of another person, or get the knowledge of the infinite number of stars supposed to be more than a million of a million will he not be a much greater man than the performer of the miracles mentioned in the four gospels. The miracles of Jesus are worthless

in comparison with the possibilities of a Yoga. Curing diseases cannot be reckoned as a miracle, devils are driven away in India even today, walking on the sea is not an extraordinary miracle if some means could be found to make the body light, reviving the widow's son and Jairus' daughter are not very extraordinary events. The greatest of all is the raising of Lazarus, who was four days in the grave and whose body was stinking which shows that decomposition had set in. Many people have written in support of the genuineness of the miracles of Jesus, Wallace being the last (p. 207). Wallace, like the other defenders of Jesus' miracles, mentions his ordinary miracles such as driving the devils, curing mad man, changing water into wine, feeding the multitude twice with a few loaves and fishes, but he carefully omits to mention the name of the dead Lazarus. He gives several instances of miraculous cures, and of spiritualistic senses which created a sensation even in India in the sixties of the last century, but no case of a dead, absolutely dead man reviving after four days' burial. Even if all these miracles be true they do not prove Jesus' godhead.

One thing strikes me as very singular. The gospels mention only thirty five miracles of Jesus. If Jesus had power to drive away the devils from persons possessed and revive to life people who were actually dead, why did he not try to drive away all the devils from Palestine and revive thousands of people who died in his three years of mission? He should have proclaimed to the world that he could do these things. Instead, he enjoined strict silence upon the apostles. 16 Mat. 20, 8 Mk. 30. If he could drive away all the devils and raise all the dead

he would have been acclaimed as a deliverer and could have avoided an ignominious death. He should also have taught his apostles how to work these miracles, but the Bible mentions only one raising of the dead by his apostles, when Peter raised Tabitha to life. 9 Acts. 36-42. Calling a man God because he performed some extraordinary things shows a very lamentable state of mind of the believer. Our conception of God ought to be much nobler.

Mahomed refused to give a sign, that is, work miracles, Koran Ch. 3 verses 179-80, saying that miracles were performed by previous apostles and they were slain. And Jesus when asked by the Pharisees to show a sign refused saying "an evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign, and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas 12 Mat. 38-40. He repeats these very words in 16 Mat. 4, and 11 L. 29. Yet we find in the Bible narrations of many extraordinary miracles. Jesus performed thirty five miracles and if these were genuine miracles, the whole country must have resounded with praise for his extraordinary powers, and the Pharisees must have heard of them if not actually seen some of them. Then why this unnecessary request and the refusal? Further Jesus had performed many miracles before he refused to show a miracle. In Ch. 12 v. 38-39 he refused to show a miracle, but in some preceding verses in the same chapter two miracles are mentioned as performed by him. He went to a synagogue on a Sabbath day, and a man with a withered hand was brought to him and he was asked whether it is lawful to heal on Sabbath day. After answering the objection of the congregation, he cured the withered hand, 12 Mat.

9-13. Then the Pharisees went out and held a council against him how they might destroy him. V. 14, and Jesus fled from the place. V. 15. This shows that the Pharisees knew that Jesus had performed a miracle on a Sabbath day. Then why did they again seek a sign? So there is a great inconsistency here. The Pharisees see a sign, get enraged at Jesus' breaking the Sabbath and conspire to kill him. Then another dumb and blind man is cured v. 22, and then the Pharisees seek a sign, vs. 38-39. What are we to believe? Did Jesus perform a miracle near the synagogue or not? If he did, then why is he asked to perform another miracle? Again he was asked by the Pharisees and Sadducees for a sign, and he refused and gave the same reply 16 Mat. 1-4. So Matthew's narration is inconsistent and if Jesus did refuse to show a sign, then the stories about the miracles are all false. The Pharisees and Sadducees were the leading people among the Jews and the High Priest was a Sadducee. If he could have convinced them of his power to work miracles, they would have hailed him as a Messiah. But he abused them and refused to work miracles. If he could have satisfied their curiosity, even the healing on a Sabbath day would have been overlooked. We are therefore obliged to decide either that Jesus refused to work miracles or did work miracles. I prefer the former alternative and believe that Jesus like Mahomed refused to perform miracles and that the stories about the miracles were subsequent inventions unfit to be believed.

CHAPTER 6.

CHRIST'S ARREST, TRIAL AND CRUCIFIXION.

Soon after his return from Gethsemane he was arrested, and a disciple drew his sword and struck off the ear of the man who had arrested him. Jesus told him to put up the sword, 23 Mat. 50-52, 14 Mark 46-47, 22 Luke 50-51, 18 J. 10-11, and Matthew adds that Jesus said "thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels"? 26 Mat. 53. This shows that Jesus never thought of resisting authority. "Then all the disciples forsook him and fled." 26 Mat. 56. 14 Mark 50. Jesus was then taken to the house of the High Priest Caiaphas, and Peter only followed him to that house, and before the cock crew thrice denied, as Jesus had foretold, that he was with him. 26 Mat. 74-75, 14 Mark 71-72, 22 Luke 59-62, 18 J. 26-27. This shows that the disciples of Jesus were moral cowards, including Peter, the foremost disciple, who added perjury to his other sins. But the whole narrative raises Jesus in the estimation of mankind. He practically surrendered himself to his enemies, though his disciples were ready and willing to drive away his captors and rescue him. His case is almost parallel with that of Socrates, the first victim of religious bigotry, who refused to escape from his prison when his influential friends suggested this course and promised to assist him in his escape. He refused on the ground that the law should have its course and should not be cheated.

After he was brought before the High Priest, the latter asked him "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the blessed." His answer was "Thou hast said", meaning, yes it is so, and added that "hereafter shall ye see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven." 26 Mat. 63, 64, 14 Mark 61-62, 22 Luke 66-70, John gives a different version. He says that Jesus merely said in answer to the query of the High Priest about his disciples and his doctrine, that he preached publicly and the High Priest should ask his hearers and not him 18 J. 19-21. The High Priest charged him, with blasphemy.

When Jesus was brought before Pilate, he asked him "Art thou the king of the Jews, and Jesus said unto him, thou sayest", meaning it is so. 27 Mat. 11, 15 Mk. 2, 23 L. 3. But 18 J. 33-37 give a different version. John says that Jesus told Pilate "My kingdom is not of this world," but he uttered also the words "thou sayest that I am a king," practically admitting the charge, but adding "to this end was I born and for this cause came I unto this world that I should bear witness unto the truth" V. 37. 23 L. 2 says that Jesus was accused of "perverting this nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, saying that he himself is Christ a king." The other gospels are silent as to the nature of the charge against Jesus. It was on account of this charge of sedition and rebellion that Pilate asked him whether he was the king of the Jews. After condemnation, when he was led to the cross, the inscription put upon his head was that he was the "King of the Jews", a political offender, 27 Mat. 37, 15 Mk. 26, 23 Luke 38, 19 J. 19. All the gospels agree on this point. So there was no charge

of blasphemy against him, nor did he advance any claim to godhead. He was punished as a rebel the crucifixion being a Roman punishment, and malefactors were put to death in this way, but the punishment for blasphemy was death by stoning, being a purely Jewish mode of punishment. The trial was by a Roman Judge, for a crime against the Cæsar of Rome, whereas if it had been for an offence against the Jewish religion, the trial would have been by the High Priest and the Sanhedrin, though it is very doubtful whether the Roman governor would have allowed the Jewish tribunal to take cognizance of an offence against a religion which was not a state religion, and the Romans were so liberal that they never interfered with any form of religious worship. So this trial and the Roman form of punishment of Jesus lead one to conclude that Jesus never claimed to be a God or an equal or inferior partner of God and was not punished for an offence against the Jewish religion. So whatever the evangelists, particularly St. John, might say about the divinity of Jesus, his accusers and other contemporaries and the judge himself were of opinion that he had proclaimed himself as the King of the Jews, who wished to lead them to political freedom.

It appears that it was usual to write the cause of the sentence. Dion Cassius (Bk. 4) speaks of the condemned being led "through the midst of the court or assembly with a writing signifying the cause of his death, and afterwards crucified" . . . "and it was written in Hebrew, Greek and the Latin."

After his sentence Jesus was led for execution to a place called Golgotha, and the cross had to be carried there. Now there is a serious discrepancy about the

person who bore it. In 27 Mat. 32, 15 Mark 21 and 23 L. 26, we find a concurrence of testimony that Simon of Cyrene was compelled to bear it. Here the names of the bearer and of his village are given and so it must be true. But in 19 J. 17 we find it stated that Jesus bore it. John was his disciple, and his favourite disciple (13 J. 23) and was present at the crucifixion (19 J. 35) and he vouches for the things he wrote (21 J. 24). But whatever may be the form of his assertion of the truth of his statement one cannot override the unanimous testimony of the Synoptic gospels that Simon of Cyrene and not Jesus bore the cross to Golgotha. But it must be admitted in support of John's statement that it was the custom according to Plutarch that the condemned carried his cross.

When Jesus was nailed to the cross, two other malefactors were also nailed to the cross, one on each side. Matthew Ch. 27. V. 44 says these with others taunted Jesus as being king of the Jews and the Son of God but unable to save himself. Mark Ch. 15 V. 23 says the same thing, but Luke says that one of them taunted him but the other chided this man for the taunt (23 L. 39-41) and asked Jesus to "remember me when thou comest unto thy kingdom, and Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee. To-day thou shalt be with me in paradise." vs. 42-43. So Jesus expected to go to paradise that very day. I shall have something to say about this verse when I shall come to the question of the resurrection of Jesus. John says that to make sure of his death the side of Jesus was pierced with a spear by a soldier and blood and water came out. Ch. 19 V. 34, the other gospels being silent about this piercing of his side.

Just before his death, Jesus uttered an exclamation,

"Eli Eli lama sabachthani," which means, God, God, why hast thou forsaken me? 27 Mat. 46, 15 Mk. 34. Why should Jesus charge God the Father with forsaking him? This shows want of faith in the absolute benevolence and justice of God. And it further shows that Jesus is not a part of the Godhead, for how can one and the same being charge his other self with such a serious charge as forsaking him? Luke says that Jesus said "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit, and having said thus, he gave up the ghost." 23 Luke 46. This is very proper language and shews perfect resignation to God's will. But Jesus here commends his spirit to God's hands. What about his body, with which he is said to have resurrected from the grave and appeared to his disciples and ascended to heaven? Is Christ still in his bodily frame or has he shed it and is existing only as a spirit which he commended to God just before his death? St. John says that Jesus said "it is finished" and he expired. This disciple was present at the crucifixion and Jesus commended to him his mother Mary, who also was present. 19 J. 26-27. It is strange that St. John, who was present, is silent as to the exclamation of Jesus as narrated by Matthew and Mark, or the assurance of Jesus to the malefactor that he would be with Jesus in paradise that very day.

When Jesus died "the veil of the temple was rent in twain from top to bottom," and there was an earthquake, and the "graves were opened" and the dead bodies arose and "came out of the graves after his resurrection and went into the holy city and appeared unto many" 27 Mat. 51-53. Mark is silent as to the opening of the graves and the earthquake. Luke and John are totally silent upon these matters. It ought

to be mentioned here that Josephus, who wrote his History soon after these events, is silent as to the injury to the temple. It ought to be mentioned here that Josephus does not mention the name of Jesus, the passage mentioning his name, which occurs in his Antiquities XVII-III-3 being considered by competent critics such as Gibbon and Strauss p. 3 to be a forgery. But Renan does not consider the passage spurious. Life of Jesus P. 4. But this passage is silent about the earthquake and the other strange events. And Tacitus who mentions the name of Christ and partially describes him in chapter 44 of his Annals is also silent as to these events. So these events may be regarded as coming out of the fertile brain of Matthew and Mark.

After his death Jesus was buried in a new grave by Joseph of Arimathea to whom Pilate delivered the body. He rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre and departed. Matthew in Ch. 27 vs. 62-66 says that on the next day Pilate allowed the high priest and Pharisees to secure the sepulchre by sealing it and to keep a watch. When afterwards the sepulchre was found empty the watch was bribed to say that while they were sleeping the disciples of Jesus stole his body 28 Mat. 11-14. This took place on the next day which was a sabbath day. Could the Jews seal the sepulchre or do any work on a sabbath day, which their law forbids? The other gospels are silent upon this matter.

CHAPTER 7.

HIS RESURRECTION.

Now we come to the most important part in the New Testament narrative, the resurrection of Christ with his entire body. I must premise by saying that the four gospels do not agree in the details of their narration of this event. Matthew says, Ch. 28 V. 2, that God's angel rolled away the stone that guarded the mouth of the sepulchre and told Mary Magdalene and her companion the other Mary that they should tell the disciples that Christ is risen and is going to Galilee before them, and when they were going back Jesus appeared before them and addressed them, whereupon they held him by the feet and worshipped him. Jesus told them to inform the disciples that he was going to Galilee where they would see him. 28 Mat. 1-10. Mark relates the same thing, 16 Mark 1-8. Now who was the other Mary? In 27 Mat. 56 we find mention of "Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James and Joses and the mother of Zebedee's children" as being present at the crucifixion. In 15 Mk. 40 the names are "Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James the less and of Joses, and Salome." So the second Mary was the mother of James and Joses. Now this Mary was also the mother of Christ himself, vide 6 Mark 3, where the names of Jesus' brothers are given as James and Joses. If this be so, we are to suppose that his mother held him by the feet and worshipped him. This is most extraordinary, particularly in an Asiatic country. It is not strange that the other gospels are silent upon this touching

of the feet. John says that when Jesus met Mary Magdalene who was the only person who had gone to the grave, (20 J. 1) "Jesus said unto her, touch me not for I am not yet ascended to my Father", (20 J. 17), though some days after, when Jesus met his disciples in Galilee, Thomas, one of them, having doubted his identity, Jesus told him to "thrust your hand unto my side" and "reach thy finger and behold my hands." 20 J. 27. Now we find that Matthew says that Mary Magdalene held the feet of Jesus. John says she was forbidden to touch him as he had not yet ascended to God, and the same Jesus, before his ascension, orders Thomas to touch him and be convinced that he was Jesus. So here is contradiction between Matthew and John. Further what did Jesus mean by telling Mary Magdalene that she should not touch him as he had not yet ascended to God? Could Mary touch him after his ascension, a physical impossibility? So these words are meaningless.

Matthew says that after this touching of the feet Jesus told the women that he was going to Galilee where the disciples will see him. Accordingly the disciples went to Galilee, and saw and worshipped him, and Jesus told them that "all power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations baptising them in the name of God the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost : teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen. Here ends Matthew's gospel. This is the first time that Jesus orders his disciples to teach all nations, also to baptise them in three names. Jesus also had baptised people, and 4 J. 1, says that he baptised more people than John the

Baptist, and in the next verse it is stated that "Jesus himself baptised not, but his disciples." Here we find no mention of God the Father, God the Son, or the Holy Ghost. John the Baptist baptised in the Jordan, and he stated that Jesus would baptise people with the Holy Ghost and with fire. Now, as previously stated, there is nothing unusual in baptism, as it is done every day by the Hindus and particularly in Ganges water, and the almanack will shew the extent of the efficacy of such baths, and lately there was an occasion when an immersion in Ganges water swept away all the sins committed in one thousand million births. One thing is to be observed here, there is no curse on unbelievers, as in 16 Mark 16. What afterwards became of Christ is not mentioned. Has he ascended heaven or is still among us ?

Mark's narration regarding resurrection is very short, and it mainly agrees with that of Matthew. The Revised Version regards verses 9 to end as spurious and they are printed at a little distance. However, it is necessary that I should give their substance, as, until authorised by the British Parliament, these verses are officially regarded as genuine and a man's destiny depends upon them for the present. In 16 Mark the Marys are stated to have gone to the sepulchre on Sunday morning and were told by a young man sitting in the sepulchre that Jesus is risen and was going to Galilee where they will see him. In verse 9 it is stated that Jesus met them. Afterwards he met two of the disciples, and afterwards to the eleven when they sat at meat, and told them "go ye unto all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned" (or

condemned according to the Revised Version), v. 16. Jesus then says that believers will cast out devils and speak with new tongues, serpents and deadly drinks will not kill them and they will cure the sick by laying their hands on them. Immediately after he was "received up into heaven and sat on the right hand of God" vs. 17-19. It has been suggested that these verses were added by Aristion. The style is quite different from that of the rest of the gospel.

These spurious verses 9-20 speak of baptism but the Trinity is not mentioned at all and they condemn the unbelievers and save the believers, whether they be good people or devils in disguise. As regards the supernatural powers of the believers, does any man believe that they possess them? What is meant by Jesus being received up unto heaven and sitting on the right hand of God, v 19? Is heaven up or below Galilee? And where is the right hand of God? Has God any hand or material body? These are all enigmas to me.

Luke says that Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James, (Jesus' brother) and other women went to the sepulchre where they found the stone rolled away and saw two men in shining armour who told them that Jesus is risen. They informed Peter who ran to the sepulchre. Jesus met two men who were going to Emmaus, and one of them told him that they had expected Jesus to have redeemed Israel. This shews the belief prevalent in his country that he was to be a political redeemer and not a spiritual redeemer. These travellers when they reached home, compelled Jesus to be their guest, and when Jesus blessed and broke the bread and gave it to them their eyes were opened and they recognized him but he

vanished out of their sight. 24 L. 21-31. These men informed the disciples that Jesus is risen, and they had met him. Afterwards he appeared to his disciples, shewed them his hands and feet asked for some food, ate some fish and said that all things concerning him written in the law of Moses, the prophets and the psalms must be fulfilled (24 L. 44). He ordered that repentance and remission of sins must be preached in his name among all nations beginning at Jerusalem. (v. 47). He then led them to Bethany, lifted up his hands and blessed them and was carried up to heaven. v. 51.

It now remains to give John's version of the resurrection contained in chapters twenty and twenty-one. He says that Mary Magdalene informed Peter and himself that the tomb was empty and they ran to it and found it so. Jesus appeared to Mary Magdalene and prevented her from touching his feet as he had not yet ascended to his Father. Mary informed the disciples, and though the door was shut Jesus entered the room in which they were assembled, showed them his hands and his side (but not his feet). Jesus said I send you as God had sent me, and breathed on them and said "receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." 20 J. 22-23. After eight days Jesus again entered their room though the doors were shut and as Thomas doubted his identity he asked him to "reach thy finger and behold my hands, and reach thither thy hands and thrust it into my side." On the third occasion Jesus met them at the sea of Tiberias, asked for food, and there was a miraculous draught of fishes, 21 J. 11 and Jesus ate them. Then Jesus charged

Peter to "feed my lambs" (v. 15) and thrice he said to Peter "Feed my sheep (v. 16, 17). He said nothing more of any importance and John who was present throughout (21 J. 7, 20-24) omits all mention of the ascension of Christ, as to which Matthew and John, the two apostles are silent, but it is mentioned only by Mark and Luke who never saw Jesus. So we may discard this story of the Ascension.

I have stated the main facts regarding the resurrection of Christ found in the four gospels. I have purposely gone into some detail in this matter for Christians from St. Paul onwards, have regarded it as the principal basis of Christianity. Paul in 15 (1 Cor.) 14 says "And if Christ be not risen then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain." Here Paul refers to the rising of Christ in his bodily shape, but immediately after he contradicts himself. After speaking of the glory of the sun, moon and stars differing from one another, he says in 15 (Cor.) 42 "So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption" and in 15 (1 Cor.) 44 he says "It is sown a natural body ; it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body." Here he seems to indicate that at the resurrection man will rise not with a physical but with a spiritual body, though there seems to be an apparent contradiction in the words "spiritual body" as the souls of dead men are said to be disembodied souls. Jesus himself in his agony just before his death commended his spirit and not his body to God. 23 Luke 46. But the same Jesus told his apostles that they would eat and drink with him in heaven (22 L. 30.) This shows that his body will also rise. Christ rose with a physical body and

ascended heaven with his physical body as stated in 24 Luke 51 and 16 Mark 19, a doubtful verse, though it is not stated how Christ was "carried up" into heaven and in what direction he went. The same Luke again mentions his ascension in 1 Acts. 9. He says in 1 Acts. 3 that the apostles saw Jesus forty days and "they asked of him saying Lord wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom of Israel." 1 Acts. 6. This shows that the apostles expected Jesus to be their temporal and not spiritual Lord and Jesus would be the national king of the Jews after driving the Roman usurpers.

If Jesus rose from the dead and his rising leads man to believe that he is God then what about Elija and Peter who raised dead men into life as stated in the Bible? No one is willing to call them God and they never claimed to be God.

No where do we find anything in the four gospels as to the time of the resurrection of Christ. They say that the women went to the sepulchre early on Sunday morning and found it empty. These women could not go earlier as Saturday was a sabbath day. So they went the next morning and did not find Jesus though they met him soon after. It was a mere accident that they went to the sepulchre on Sunday and met Jesus while returning. The angels whom they met in the sepulchre told them that Jesus was not there but had risen. They did not say when he had risen. So the tradition that Jesus rose on Sunday morning is based on nothing. He might have risen long before. Then why is Sunday called Lord's Day? And why is it so religiously observed? Mind, among the Jews night precedes day, but among Christians day precedes night. So if Sunday be the

Lord's Day it begins from early morning when the women saw the risen Jesus. But what prevented Jesus from rising on the previous Saturday which commenced when Jesus was put in the sepulchre, or on the night of Saturday according to Christian calculation? So there is no justification for calling Sunday the Lord's Day. And what fuss have the Christians, particularly Protestants, and most particularly the Scots, made of this day. I shall give two instances in support of my statement. In England in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries it was a penal offence for a man to kiss his wife or child on Sundays, the penalty being a fine, or doing penance in the church or public flogging. In Scotland it was a penal offence to take a walk over two miles on Sunday unless the destination was the church, just as the Jews never walked more than a mile on Saturdays, which was called a Sabbath day's journey.

Jesus, when he met his apostles for the last time after his resurrection and before his ascension, told them to preach the gospel and baptise all nations, 28 Mt. 19, 16 Mt. 15, 24 L. 47, though John is totally silent upon this matter. But soon after his ascension the apostles began to quarrel as to whether the Gentiles should be baptised. 11 A. 1-3, and the matter was settled after a long discussion in which Peter, James and Paul took part 15 A. 1-29, and the Gentiles were admitted into the rite of baptism. In this long discussion, speeches were made by Peter and others, who never said that the parting words of Jesus should decide the matter, but Peter said that he had been chosen by God to preach the gospel to the circumcised and the uncircumcised. It might be said that God here means Jesus, but the latter name is

separately mentioned in verse 11, so that here God is not identified with Christ. Further nowhere did Jesus choose Peter to baptise the Gentiles so "that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel." This is inconsistent with the parting words of Jesus. This leads me to suppose that those words were subsequent interpolations.

St. Clement is mentioned by Paul in 4 Phil. 3, whose name is in the "book of life." He afterwards became Bishop of Rome according to Eusebius, Epiphanius and St. Hierome. Most probably he succeeded Peter and Paul to that chair. In his first epistle to the Corinthians, sections 24-25, he gives three reasons, which he believed to be very cogent, in support of resurrection, which I suspect will not carry any weight with the moderns. They are (1) "Day and night manifest a resurrection to us," Sec. 24. Resurrection means return to life after death. The ancients believed that the sun died every day. The Vedas say this though in one place it is stated that after evening the sun reverses its bright face and again turns round in the morning. Ait. Bra 3. 4. 4 This shows that Clement believed that the sun was revived in the morning after death. (2) After the seed is sown in the ground it "dissolves, and from the dissolution the great power of the providence of the Lord raises it again, and of one seed many arise, and bring forth fruit." (3) In Arabia, "there is a certain bird called phoenix. There is only one such bird at a time. It lives 500 years, and when its death approaches, it makes its nest, into which it enters and dies. Its dead flesh germinates some worms which produce feathers" and when it is grown to a perfect state, it takes up the nest in which the bones of its

parent lie, and carries up from Arabta into Egypt, to a city called Heliopolis, and flying in open day, in the sight of all men, lays it upon the altar of the sun, and so returns from whence it came. The priests then search into the records of the time and find that it returned precisely at the end of five hundred years."

Mahomed also adduces the instance of the dead earth revived by rain in favour of his theory of the resurrection Ch. 16 v. 67, Ch. 36 v. 33, Ch. 43 v. 10. These arguments must have carried great weight with people who lived a thousand or two years ago. But unfortunately, astronomy, biology, botany and other sciences have made such rapid progress that one loses his gravity in replying to these arguments, and so I leave them alone.

I wish to say a few words more about Christ's resurrection. In 23 L. 42 we find one of the malefactors crucified by his side telling Jesus "Lord remember me when thou comest unto thy kingdom." Jesus said in reply "Verily, I say unto thee, to-day thou shalt be with me in paradise" v. 43. From this it appears that Jesus expected to go to paradise that very day and gave hope to the malefactor to meet him there that very day. If the story of the resurrection be true then Christ was in the grave till Sunday morning when he rose from the grave and met Mary Magdalene and others. In fact he had often predicted that he would be killed and rise on the third day, 12 Mat. 40, 16. Mat. 21, 17 Mat. 23, 20 Mat. 19, 8 Mark 31, 9 Mark 31, 10 Mark 34, 9 L. 22, 18 L. 33, 24 L. 7. So Jesus was to rise on the third day, and if so how could he be in heaven on the day of his death? If it be said in reply that he went to heaven on the first day and came back to rise again

on the third day, when this saying that he would rise on the third day 9 L. 31, or after three days 8 L. 31, becomes erroneous. There is this further difficulty. In 20 J. 17 Jesus says to Mary Magdalene when she attempted to touch his feet after his resurrection "touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father, but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God." This shews that till then Jesus had not yet ascended to heaven, or to God. So Jesus never went to paradise before he met Mary and therefore either the malefactor was disappointed in his expectation to meet Jesus in heaven that very day or the resurrection on the third day never took place, and the foundation of Christianity, according to St Paul falls to the ground.

The resurrection of Christ is not a more extraordinary event than the raising of Lazarus who had died four days previous to his resurrection by Christ and whose body had begun to stink. The probability is that Jesus did not die on the Cross. He either feigned death or suspended his animation. There have been many instances of revival after hanging. It was easier to revive after crucifixion. Josephs, in vita 75, relates that he once met several prisoners who had been crucified, as he perceived three acquaintance among them, he begged of Titus to give them to him. They were accordingly immediatly removed and carefully attended to, and one was actually saved but the other two could not be revived. It appears that when Jesus was removed from the Cross, evening was approaching when the Sabbath would begin. So everything had to be done in a hurry. The body was hastily removed and taken by Joseph of Arimathea who tried to revive Jesus and succeeded,

and Jesus left the country, which was unsafe for him, and he never returned. He had probably been to India and learnt the Yoga system which teaches how to suspend breath for a long period. I do not wish to go as far as Mahomed. He says that Jesus was not crucified but his substitute was. Koran Ch. IV. v. 156.

The reader, perhaps, will laugh at my above observations. But let him read what an Englishman says took place in the Court of Maharaja Ranjit Singh, the Lion of the Punjab, who was the ruler of that country in the beginning of the last century and died in 1839. The Englishman says that a Hindu Fakir named Sadhu Haridas was put in a sack which was sewn up. It was then placed in a wooden chest and the lid was rivetted down and Maharaja's own seal was put on several places. It was then lowered into a brick vault. Earth was placed upon it and some corn was sown which sprang up during the period of the sadhu's internment. The walls of the vault were bricked up and it was roofed. All this took place in the presence of the Maharaja and his whole Court, besides some French and English doctors. A battallion of troops guarded the place day and night and the Maharaja got reports every morning and evening. After 40 days, the Maharaja ordered the walls of the vault to be broken. He was accompanied by the Englishman who has narrated these events. They entered the vault, the earth was removed, the seals were broken and the sadhu was taken out of the box by his servant who cut the sack open. A salute was fired and many people came to see the sadhu. His body was rubbed by the Maharaja and the Englishman. The doctors present could not detect any sign of life. Some hot water was poured upon him

and a hot wheaten cake was twice placed upon his head. The wax and cotton which had shut up his ears and the nostrils were removed. The sadhu's mouth was opened by a knife and his tongue drawn forward, but it flew inside several times and shut up the gullet as it had previously done. His eyelids were rubbed with ghee (clarified butter) and they opened, but they were almost lifeless. Another hot cake was placed upon the head when the body began to convulse and the nostrils were inflated and his respiration ensued and his pulse slightly returned. Some ghee was put upon his tongue and he was made to swallow it, when his eyes resumed their natural colour, and the sadhu recognising the Maharaja asked in a very low voice 'do you believe me now.' The Maharaja replied in the affirmative and invested him with a pearl necklace, gold bracelets and pieces of silk and muslin. All this took place within half an hour "and in another half an hour," the Englishman says, "the Fakir talked with myself and those about him freely, though feebly, like a sick person. Then we left him, convinced that there had been no fraud or collusion in the exhibition we had witnessed." I am a sceptic of sceptics, but I am compelled after this narrative to declare my agreement with the Englishman when he says that although it is incredible that a man should survive after this long burial in a hermetically sealed box in an air-tight room, yet "I was bound to declare my belief in the facts which I have represented, however impossible their existence may appear to others."

About seventy years ago a fakir was fished up by some fishermen from the bed of the river Hooghly opposite Calcutta. He was found alive but the doctors

killed him by giving him beef extract and other nourishment which did not suit him. This was a case of suspended animation as the man could not breathe under the water. In my own house I have seen a lathial, or player with sticks, who was in my service, imitate a dead body. He, a fair complexioned man, suspended his breath and became as pale as a dead man. His breath was gone, and he was revived by his followers by rubbing his body for some minutes when he began to draw breath. This was in the afternoon in the presence of many people. The fact is that there are many things on earth which are not dreamt off in any philosophy. Because we cannot explain an event, however extraordinary it may be, we should not call it a miracle and attribute godhead to the worker, as it is not the principal business of God to work some petty miracles, but to govern this world, nay this universe, and see that all goes well.

CHAPTER 8

THE APOSTLES.

I think I have narrated in the previous paragraphs all the important sayings and doings of Christ. I therefore turn to the other books contained in the New Testament, commencing with the Acts of the Apostles written by Luke the evangelist. The first thing he says is that Jesus was seen of the apostles forty days and speaking of things pertaining to the kingdom of God. I. A. 3. We find no trace of this in any of the gospels. In his own gospel Luke says that Jesus' advise to the apostles after his resurrection was simply to preach the gospel to all nations and to tarry in Jerusalem, "Until ye be endowed with power from on high." 24 L. 47-49. In his gospel he does not say a word as to the duration of the period Jesus was with his disciples. From John we learn that Jesus visited them on the day of resurrection, 20 J. 19, and after eight days again he appeared to his disciples, v. 26, and his third and last visit, 21 J. 14, took place in the sea of Tiberias 21 J. I. The Acts extend the story of Jesus' stay to a great length of time and we have no record of what he spoke concerning the things pertaining to the kingdom of God.

I pass over unimportant matters such as the fate of Judas, as it is not of much importance whether he hanged himself or fell headlong from a tree, or whether he returned the thirty shekels or bought a field with the money I. A. 18.

In 8 A. 16-17 we find that the Holy Ghost had not fallen upon some people who had been baptised in

the name of Jesus, but the moment Peter and Paul laid their hands on them, they received the Holy Ghost. This shews that the laying of hands is absolutely necessary even in the case of persons baptised in the name of Jesus. What is meant by the name of Jesus, and what turns upon the laying of hands one fails to understand.

In 8 A. 39-40 we find one Philip just after, baptising an eunuch being invisible to him and being translated to a distant place. It is almost parallel to the ascension of Jesus, the only difference being that Philip did not leave the earth.

In 9 A. 4-5 we find Paul's vision of Jesus and in 10 A. 11 Peter's vision of the heaven opening and in 19 A. 3 we find certain people who had been baptised unto John's baptism, were again baptised in the name of Jesus, and Paul laid his hands upon them, and the Holy Ghost descended upon them and they spoke with tongues. What the difference is between the two baptisms, one of which was that in which Jesus was baptised, I fail to understand. Perhaps there is something in the laying of hands which the apostles introduced.

In 9 A. 40 we find that Tabitha after her death was restored to life by Peter. He prayed and she was restored to life. I wish all prayers particularly, the mother's prayer, had that efficacy.

In 24 A. 14 Paul follows Christ in saying that "so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things that are written in the law and in the prophets." I think no Christian believes in the law of retribution enunciated by God through Moses which says "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth etc." As I have discussed this matter in relation to Christ I pass it over now,

but this I must say here that this judaising of Christianity is the greatest blot on it. I shall return to this matter again.

Then begin the epistles, and Paul's epistle to the Romans heads the list. In 2 Rom. 13 he says that "the doers of the law shall be justified" but in 3 Rom. 20 he says "therefore by the deeds of law shall no flesh be justified in God's sight, for by the law is the knowledge of sin," and in verse 28 he says "therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of law." These are contradictory passages, in the first saying the doers of law said to be justified, in the latter saying it is faith only which justifies a man and not the deeds of law. James is of a different opinion. He neither relies on the deeds of the law nor faith as the basis of his religion. After saying that "pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this—to visit the fatherless and the widows in their affliction and to keep himself unspotted from the world." (1 James 27) he says "what doth it profit, my brethren, though a man says he hath faith and have not works, can faith save him, 2 James 14, and that faith, if it hath not works is dead being alone" v. 17. and he comes to the conclusion that "faith without works is dead" v. 20.

Before discussing this difficult matter in which the two apostles totally disagree, I should give the celebrated definition of faith given by Paul in his epistle to the Hebrews, the genuineness of which has been doubted. He says (11 Heb. 1) that "faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things are hoped for, which one never gets, and there are people who have most unrealisable hopes. Is that faith? Paul should have at last used the words

"reasonably hoped for." As to the second part of the definition it is clearly wrong. What right has a man to assume that the things unseen really exist. Such a faith really leads one to believe anything inside or outside religion. Most things we quarrel about, except wordly happiness and visible objects, are taken on trust and a man would be justified to believe any of them if this definition stands, as reason is not included in this definition.

What does Paul mean by saying that faith is the substance of things hoped for? Many things are hoped for by many people, some attain the objects hoped for, some do not. Shall we say that there was faith in both cases. Further some men expect to get what is totally beyond their power to get. Is it faith? Some men get unexpected things. Of course there was no faith here as the things were not hoped for. So that it comes to this, that faith is concerned with things one expects, no matter whether he succeeds or not in his expectation.

As to faith being the evidence of things not seen, it is very difficult to distinguish between this faith and belief. Is every belief included in the definition of faith? Every Hindu believes that there are 330 millions of gods. You may call this faith. But what test is there of the faith being true? If there be no test every man will be justified in believing anything and everything. If faith be synonymous with belief, then there is nothing novel in this definition of faith, it includes all beliefs, rational or irrational, provable or not provable.

Let us return to the question as to whether a man is justified by faith or by works. Works here mean good works, as no one will agree in saying that

murder, a bad work, will justify a man. By justification is meant justification in the eyes of God, that which leads to heaven. If faith be the sole justification of man, then the question arises, faith in what? Paul will say, belief in Christ. The next question is what is that belief? The answer will be, belief in Christ's divinity. Agreed. Therefore it comes to this that mere belief in Christ's divinity will take a man to heaven. Is that so? Many booldthirsty men, destroyers of the human race, have believed in Christ's divinity. Will they go to heaven, whereas angelic non-Christians will go to hell, as they have nothing to justify them. Every religious teacher of note has said, believe in my god or gods and you will go to heaven, otherwise not. Thus faith in the Mahomedan religion will take a man to heaven after resurrection. The Hindus will say believe in our gods and you will go to heaven. Faith is the guiding principle of salvation in all these religions. So it comes to this that faith must be limited to a particular religion not necessarily Christianity, to entitle a man to attain salvation, and want of faith leads one to hell. Now the question naturally is which of these religions is true. Paul's definition of faith does not solve this difficult question. So that it comes to this that a man is justified by faith, whatever it may be. In other words a man may believe any form of religion and will attain heaven.

This is one of the doctrines of Bhagabatgeeta, wherein Krishna says that man may reach him no matter by what route he comes, something like "all roads lead to Rome." Herein lies the catholicity of the Hindu religion, a thing unknown to any one of the Shemitic religions which lead to heaven the

followers of a particular religion and condemns all unbelievers to hell. The Buddhist religion also is very catholic in this respect. It promises ultimate nirvan to all created beings, man, beast, fish, reptile or worm, in fact to all animated nature. This Buddhistic idea has been adopted by the Hindus, which has thus ennobled their religion. Let not the reader suppose that I am a Hindu in religion. I am a great hater of idolatry and its necessary adjunct, priestcraft. But I must give praise where it is due. Hindus and Buddhists have never killed any antagonist of their religion and have never spread their religion by the sword, nor suppressed heresy by any Holy (?) Inquisition. All honor to Hindus and Buddhists for their grand ideas of humanity and if we have to discriminate between the two we should give the palm to the Buddhists, as Buddha is the earliest founder of the religion of "Ahimsa parama Dharma," non-killing is the highest religion. On behalf of Hindus and Buddhists I challenge all the Jews, Christians, and Mahomedans to point out any instance of compulsion in religion, which Mahomed at first abhorred by saying "let there be no compulsion in religion" 2 Koran v. 257 but which he afterwards abrogated, when he had suffered terrible persecution at the hands of the Meccans, which converted him from a peaceful citizen of Mecca to its bitterest enemy.

It is very difficult to understand what Paul meant by faith. He says (9 Rom. 31-32) that the Jews followed the law of righteousness, but did not attain it as they sought it not by faith but by works of law. Had not the Jews any faith in their religion? This shews that Paul was for faith and faith only and did

not care for the works of the law. I have shewn above how James differs from him in this matter, holding a diametrically different opinion. This reminds me of the different ways of salvation enunciated in the Bhagabadgeeta: the path of faith, the path of works and the path of knowledge. I am not concerned with the last as it is a purely Indian idea, first enunciated by Buddha, and is not to be met with in any religions which originated outside India.

The question now is, which is the better idea—salvation by faith, or salvation by works, i. e. good and pious works. As to the former I have said enough to shew that it will be a wrong guiding principle, as faith will save only the followers of the particular religion believed in, and condemn the rest and there is no knowing for certainty as to which religion is true, whatever may be the certificate it bears from any eminent person and whatever may be its credentials. On the other hand if charity be the main factor in salvation, then works i. e. good works, are absolutely necessary for salvation. In 13 (1 Cor) 13 Paul says “and now abideth faith, hope, and charity, these three: but the greatest of these is charity” and in 3 Col. 14 he gives the first place to charity and in 1 (1 Tim) 5 he says the same thing. It might be said that Paul joins faith and charity. But nobody denies that faith is a motive for works. In fact it is a great factor for all good works. But what I say is that it alone cannot save, it plays only a subordinate part. It is charity and charity only that can save, if there be anything like salvation hereafter, as to which I do not wish to pass any opinion now. So Paul here gives preference to charity, and says it is superior to faith and hope, which is a part of faith. So even according to Paul,

works are superior to faith, and herein he agrees with James. Paul in one place goes to the other extreme. He becomes a follower of the doctrine of karma, the principal doctrine of the Buddhists regarding salvation, afterwards adopted by the Hindus. In 6 Gal. 5 he says "every man shall bear his own burden" and in v. 7 he says "whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap." The fact is that though Paul is the principal exponent of the doctrine of salvation by faith, his strong common sense told him that a mere passive mental state unaccompanied by corresponding action is not enough to save mankind.

Paul's inclination was towards salvation by faith, but he sometimes preached salvation by works, and in one place he went so far as Buddha, who had preached the doctrine of karma, or works, with this difference that Paul thought that there will be only one eternal life after death as men will live for ever after their resurrection from the grave, whereas Buddha more logically thought that the effect of karma will last for many existences of the same man till he attains Nirvana, or final extinction. Paul says in 6 Gal. 5, that "every man shall bear his own burden" and in v. 7 he says "whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap." This is sound common sense and more logical, for why should a robber, private or kingly, a cruel man and a wicked man be saved simply by faith in Christ without suffering for his sins? Buddha's doctrine is much better. He taught the doctrine of the gradual mental and moral improvement of man and all sentient beings. If all men who have faith are to be saved, then they all become men of equal mental and moral progress, and their souls require no further incentive to elevation after the final judgment

of Christ. In fact the doctrine of Jesus is incomplete. He does not say what men will do after entry into heaven. As to the damned they will suffer from eternal hell fire and be always roasted alive, a nice, brilliant, and least horrifying idea, and will have no time to think of their mental and moral progress, which can do them no good by altering their fate. The doctrine of Buddha is much better. There will be eternal progress of the individual, till he becomes perfect by attaining perfect peace of mind. The fact is that Jesus adopted the Zoraastrian ideas of resurrection and of heaven and hell without working it out to its logical conclusion. He should have said what men will do after they are saved and sent to heaven. In 22 L. 29-30 he says addressing the apostles, "And I appoint you a kingdom as my Father hath appointed unto me ; that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." This is before the trial, and the apostles will eat and drink with Jesus. But what after the trial ? Will the apostles and other men sit idle and do nothing or only eat and drink ? Is that the ultimate end of existence, and the destiny of man ? So I again repeat my remark that the doctrine of Jesus in this respect is incomplete and illogical and that the doctrine of Buddha is much better and more logical and it appears that Buddha is the precursor of the doctrine of conservation of energy. A cause begets an effect, the effect becomes a cause, and this again begets an effect and this goes on for ever. Buddha's religion is full of philosophy and science, for instance he discovered the universal law of change, but Jesus was totally ignorant of science and philosophy as all Jews were. Hence this

superiority of Buddha over Christ. Spencer promulgated the theory of Evolution, but he did not go beyond death but Buddha taught the theory of Evolution of the soul after death.

So much for faith and works. It seems that Paul had no definite ideas about the way to salvation. He extols faith, then he prefers charity, then speaks like a Buddhist and emphasises on good works, and lastly says that man is not justified by any of these things, but is saved only by the grace of God as we are all sinners, 3 Rom. 24, 12 (2 Cor) 9, 2 Eph. 5, 8. What this grace is he nowhere defines, and it is a pity that the word, upon the meaning of which our destiny for all time depends, is not properly defined or explained. The context shews that it means unmerited favour. Why God should shew such favour upon some and not upon others passes my comprehension, and it is not conformable to God's goodness and impartiality that He should bestow this favour upon some and not upon others, when all are sinners more or less. Of course Paul's idea is that Christians will be saved by God's grace not we heathens, however good we may be. Then it comes to this, that Christians deserve this grace and not others, so that faith in Jesus is the deciding factor in this matter of bestowal of grace.

This idea of salvation by God's grace is connected with another idea of Paul—the idea of predestination. In 8 Rom 29 and 2 Eph. 8-10 Paul says that God had foreknowledge of those who love God and God predestined them to conform to the image of Christ, and so God had preordained their salvation, not due to their good works, but through grace and faith. Here grace, faith, preordination by God are mentioned

as the deciding factors in a man's salvation, and works, however good, are brushed aside. So the conclusion ought to be that Paul had no definite ideas regarding the way to salvation, faith, hope, charity, predestination and grace are all jumbled together. Here I ought to mention that this foreknowledge of and election, by God are also enunciated by Peter (1 Pet.) 2. Even Christ had preached the doctrine of election, saying that on the last day men will be divided into two groups, the elect and the non-elect. 24 Mat. 22, 24, 31 ; 13 Mk. 20, 22, 27. Paul goes further than Christ and Peter. He speaks of the book of life. 4 Phillip 3.

I should say a few words regarding grace. In the Old Testament it means simply favour, as in the phrase to 'find grace' (6 Gen.) 8. In the New Testament it means the free unmerited favour of God to man, something contrasted with the Law. 6 Rom. 14: "for sin shall not have dominion over you : for ye are not under the Law, but under grace." In 1 Gal. 15 Paul says that "God called me by his grace," in 2 Eph. 8 he says "by grace you are saved through faith," in 3 Rom. 24, he says "being justified freely by grace through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ," in 15 (1 Cor.) 10, he says "by the grace of God I am what I am" and in 12 (2 Cor.) 9 he says that "Lord said unto me : My grace is sufficient for thee." The word is used in 1 James 11 as meaning comeliness. So Paul is the only apostle using the word in the sense of unmerited favour. Now why should there be any unmerited favour shown to any man ? Simply because he has faith in Christ ? Was there any grace before Jesus was born ? Paul lays stress upon faith. If the faithful are to find grace, then we get the reason of the merited favour. But why should

there be any reason why a man should find favour with God for no merit of his. Christ never used this word and Paul coins this word in a new sense to convey an idea which Jesus never entertained. This is purely Pauline Christianity and not that of Jesus, who could never brook the idea of an undeserving man getting redemption. Paul uses this word in other places too such as 11 Rom. 5-6. "Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace." "And if by grace, then is it no more of works : otherwise grace is no more grace : otherwise work is no more work." This shows that he did not rest salvation upon works. Previously he had rested it upon faith, now he adds grace. According to Paul deeds do not count at all 3 Rom. 20 and other verses previously cited, "by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight for by the law is the knowledge of sin."

In 2 Phillipians 6-8 Paul says "Jesus Christ being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God : but made himself of no reputation and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men ; and being formed in fashion as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." What does all this mean ? Jesus was in the form of God but took the form of man and so was amenable to death. What is the form of God ? Has he any form ? 1 Gen. 27 says that man was made in the image of God, but here we find the reverse process God Jesus was made in the form of man. I can understand neither of these verses, how man is the image of God or God the image of man, for the simplest of reasons, that God never had any form. Are we seeing the image

of God all round us, and did those who saw Jesus see the image of God? These are all enigmas to me. The fact is that all religious writings must be enigmatical, mysterious and beyond the comprehension of ordinary mortals. I believe Paul himself did not realise the full effect of his words.

Paul goes one step further in what he states in 1 Col. 15-17 and in 1 Heb. 2. Not only is Christ the image of God but he is also "the first born of every creature," for he created all things in heaven and earth and "he is before all things and by him all things consist." Christ is the firstborn of every creature. Was Christ ever born of course excluding his birth in the house of Joseph? I thought God is never born. Then Jesus created all things. The Genesis says that God created all things and all religions agree in this. Jesus himself never claimed to have been the Creator, but Paul is bold enough to attribute creation to him, deposing God from his proper place. Paul thinks more highly of Jesus than of God. He says referring to the wicked that God will send strong delusions that they should believe a lie: that they might be damned who believeth not the truth but had pleasure in unrighteousness 2 (2 Thess) 9-12. In another place he says "God hath mercy on whom he will have mercy and whom he will he hardeneth" 9 Rom. 18. So I see that Paul is more favourably inclined to Jesus than to God, else why does he say that God deludes some people and hardens the souls of some? These are very bad attributes. They should not be attributed even to a good man, let alone God.

Paul says that Christ is for Jews and Gentiles and he is called the apostle of the Gentiles, but he calls

God "the God of our fathers" 22 A. 14 and in another place "God of my father," 24 A. 14, in other words God is the God of the Israelites and not of the whole human race. Does he mean to say that God is the God solely of the Jews and has nothing to do with the rest of mankind, whereas Jesus came to save the whole human race though sent by the God of his fathers. I fail to see why Jesus should be extolled at the expense of God. God is the god of all men and creatures, but Jesus is only for the elect, whom only he will save.

In 11 (2 Cor) 3 Paul refers to the serpent's beguiling of Eve. In 5 Rom. 17 he refers to Adam's guilt. In 24 A 14 he believes "all things which are written in the law and the prophets." In this last saying he merely follows Christ who said that he came not to destroy the law and the prophets but to fulfil them. But in the first two passages he expressly puts his faith upon the tasting of the forbidden fruit by Adam and Eve and in the subsequent verses in 5 Rom 12, 14 and 15 (1 Cor.) 21, 22 he says that as Adam brought sin and death to all men, so Christ brought eternal life to men through righteousness, though Christ himself is absolutely silent regarding Adam's guilt.

This is the main factor in determining the judaizing character of Christianity. The Jewish circumcision had been abolished for the Gentiles by Peter and the other apostles 15 A. 19, 23-29, and 21 A. 25, and the only prohibition related to the eating of things offered to idols, from blood, strangled meat, 10 (1 Cor.) 28 and fornication. So practically the Gentile converts were not bound to follow the law of Moses. If so why should they be made to believe in the story

of man's fall ? But Paul was a Jew and believed, as above stated, in every book of the Old Testament, particularly the books of Moses.

Moses had no knowledge of the great law of change which brings decay and death, afterwards enunciated by Buddha. Everything must change and everything must be born, it must grow and ultimately decay. That has been the history of the world and that is the history of all material things. This law applies to other things as well. Look at the history of empires. There were born, they grew and ultimately vanished. This law of change is one of the greatest discoveries in science and philosophy and is as universal as the laws of gravitation of Newton and that of Evolution of Spencer. But Moses was not a scientist nor a philosopher and I believe no Jew was a philosopher before Spinoza, who died in 1677.

It is necessary here to go into the question of the authenticity of the books of Moses. They pretend to have been written in the fourteenth century B. C. but modern critics have shown that portions of those books were written in the eighth century and the rest in the seventh century, Religious Systems of the world pp. 42-3. Further the Bible states that a book of the law of Moses was accidentally discovered in the Temple in the eighteenth year of the reign of Josiah corresponding to 621 B. C. by the High Priest Hilkiah, 6 (1 Ch.) 13, 34 (2 Ch.) 14, 11 Neh. 11. So this book is of very recent date as no one knows when this book discovered by Hilkiah was composed. So the whole story of man's original sin falls to the ground and with it the necessity of a saviour to redeem mankind from that sin, which is the principal basis of Christianity. This is the effect of judaising Christia-

nity, and resting such a good religion on such a slender basis, and if Christianity ever dies, as all mundane things die, it will be principally owing to this form of judaising the religion of Christ. Renan is of opinion that the grammar and history of the Pentateuch are posterior to the time of Moses. And modern critics are of opinion that the Pentateuch was composed partly in the 8th and partly in the 7th century B. C. though Moses flourished long before the building of the Temple in 1000 A. D. So these books are apocryphal. Religious Systems of the World pp. 42-43.

Critics state that these books narrate events which the Jews learnt from the Babylonians, and that in fact the story of the deluge has been copied from their story of the deluge. As regards the ark containing the covenant of God with Abraham we learn from Tacitus that when Pompey the Great entered the Holy of Holies which according to Paul (9 Heb. 4-7) could only be entered by the High Priest once a year, he found that the room was totally empty, shewing that so long the High Priest was practising a deceit upon the Jews by pretending to enter an empty room supposed to contain the ark of the covenant. Of course no one can say whether the book found by Hilkiiah was a genuine copy of the law. Moses is said to have lived 1400 years before Christ, but his book is, I believe, mentioned for the first time in this connection, and his name and his books are rarely mentioned by name in the rest of the Old Testament. Spinoza says that the Pentateuch and the other historical books of the Old Testament were written by Ezra and by Moses. De witte says that in the Pentateuch there is no genuine history, all is fable and legend,

and he has a large following. So Pauline Christianity rests upon the authenticity of some doubtful books, and I would say, why should we rest our salvation upon these doubtful books? It is strange that Christians rested their salvation upon those and others books without any criticism, and it remained for Baur and Strauss to start in 1835 the school of critical study of the gospels.

Now if Christianity is to be based upon the original sin let us examine how far the story of the Genesis is probable. In the first place, there are two versions of the creation of man. In 1 Gen. 27 we find that God created man and woman in his own image, whatever that may mean, and he blessed them to be fruitful. In 2 Gen. 1 we find that on the seventh day God took rest after his immense labour in creating everything. In 2 Gen. 7 we find that God created man, and in vs. 20-27 we find that Eve was created out of Adam's rib and presented to him. This time Eve was created after Adam had named all creatures and birds which must have taken a long time whereas 2 Gen. 1 shews that the seventh day came after Adam and Eve had been created.

How the universe was created by God the Genesis does not say. It merely says that God said, let such a thing come into existence and it came into existence. But how could something come out of nothing, it does not say. The fact is that the author of the Genesis did not explain the mode of creation. Swedenburg gets over this difficulty by saying that "the Lord from eternity, who is Jehovah, created the universe and all things thereof from himself and from nothing" Divine Providence p. 1. This does not explain anything. Are all things parts of God, as they were

created out of God himself? Different people have attempted to explain how creation took place. Several Hindu books have given different versions on the subject of creation and they have assumed that the universe was void and by degrees creation took place.

The serpent tempted Eve and she ate the fruit of the forbidden tree of knowledge and made Adam eat it. Afterwards God came to the garden of Eden in the cool of the day, as perhaps the place was too hot then, and called them and cursed them and removed them from the garden which contained the tree of life thus bringing death into this world. This is the short summary of the Bible story regarding man's fall. God told them that the women will suffer the pangs of child birth and the men will work in sorrow for their bread. This was the curse for the original sin. Christ came to redeem mankind from the effect of this sin. Has he done so? The pangs of child birth are suffered by all women, Christian and heathen and by all beasts and all men work for their bread, whatever their religion may be, though there are a few men of all religions who never labour to earn their bread, and thus escape from the curse.

I have a few observations to make on this subject. In the first place God gave the injunction to Adam only, before he created Eve. So was Eve also bound by this injunction? Secondly could serpents speak then, thirdly why should God have removed the tree of life altogether from the garden and made all animals, and if plants have life as Professor Jagadish Bose has proved, then all plants are mortal like men? What sin did these animals, birds and all living creatures and all plants commit to suffer the punishment meted out,

let us suppose justly, to Adam and Eve? Fourthly why should Adam and Eve's children suffer likewise? What sin have they committed? Has not the same God who brought death upon Adam and Eve say in 24 Deut. 16 that "the fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers, every man shall be put to death for his own sin," though God had said in 5 Deut. 9 "I am a jealous God visiting the iniquity of fathers to the third or fourth generation of them that hate me." If even the haters' fifth generation could go scot free why should all generations of Adam and Eve suffer death? And why should all other creatures, besides the descendants of the two sinners, Adam and Eve, suffer death? Did they eat the fruit of the forbidden tree? If so, when and on what occasion? It is a matter of astonishment that Christians should believe this story of man's fall and that the greatest epic poet of England should base his best poetry on this story.

I do not wish to invoke the aid of Darwin and his followers to throw discredit on this story of Genesis. Most biologists are followers of Darwin and if we have to believe that the primitive ancestors of the human race were not men, what becomes of our descent from Adam?

Nor do I wish to invoke the aid of astronomy and geology and the allied sciences to prove that the universe could not have been created in six days. By day we understand and the authors of Genesis understood a day of 24 hours, not a day of the Hindu god Brahma, consisting of millions of years. There are some worlds in embryo and they will take millions of years to form. Our own earth has taken millions

of years to form. So the whole story of the creation of the universe in the course of six days, as we understand the word, is pure fiction and so the sciences of Astronomy, Biology and Geology fully disprove the story of the Genesis.

CHAPTER 9.

TRINITY.

It does not fall within my province to go into the history of Christianity, and mention the several schisms which arose within the bosom of it. I would mention only the Arian schism to state that the Council of Nice has settled once for all the doctrine of Trinity, or Unity in Trinity. The several divisions of the Church into the Western and Eastern Churches or the history of Protestantism are not within the scope of this work. Nor do I intend to describe the events connected with the seven crusades which took place from 1096 to 1270 the principal object of which was the delivery of Jerusalem from the hands of the Moslems. The Christians captured it in 1099 but Saladin recaptured it in 1187 and it was in the hands of the Moslems since then until taken by the allies in 1917. After the war it was made over to a Mahomedan ruler.

I do not wish to enter into the history of this question fully as it has been very ably dealt with by Gibbon in the twenty first chapter of his immortal work. I shall touch only the religious aspect of the question. I have nowhere found any satisfactory solution of the question, why should there be three equal persons with different functions in the divinity when one is enough for all purposes? The Hindus have their triad, Brahma, the creator, Vishnu, the preserver, and Shiva, the destroyer. But separate functions are assigned to each of them and they have separate wives, though the Hindus say that they are really

one, which is meaningless, as the husbands and wives are separately worshipped with separate mantras and their features and the colour of their skin are not alike. This is a verbal quibble which is incomprehensible to ordinary laymen and I doubt very much whether those, who, in India or Europe, advance the theory of Unity in Trinity are really serious and understand what they say. Why launch an idea which you cannot understand and nobody can? I suspect the real difficulty lies in the spurious verse 16 Mark 16 where Jesus says "those who believeth in me and be baptised shall be saved, and those who believeth not shall be damned." There are two meanings of the word 'believe.' It may mean belief in the truth of his sayings or belief in his godhead, and it is the latter meaning which compels Christian to admit Christ in the Godhead. God the father cannot be dispensed with. If Christ be added for the above reason, then why not also admit the divinity of the Holy Ghost, and so there is Trinity, the composition of which no one understands, as how can three consubstantial persons be in the same person? Gibbon has exposed the fallacy of this dogma with his usual ridicule and I do not wish to say anything more on this subject.

As regards the doctrine of the Trinity which is now followed by almost all Christians and which is a very difficult matter to understand and which caused a split among the Christians till solved by the Council of Nice in 325, I can find nothing in the sayings of Christ in support of it. The followers of Athanasius and of Arius quarrelled about the word Logos (Word) found in the opening verse of John, and if John's gospel be held to be spurious, as is the opinion of

Renan, the question does not at all arise. Assuming his gospel to be genuine, what do we find about the godhead of the Holy Ghost? Jesus calls it the Comforter (Paraclete, advocate) 14 J. 16, 26, 15 J. 26, which he will pray God to send to his apostles, adding that it will not come until he goes away, 16 J. 7. Jesus nowhere says that God the Father, he and the Holy Ghost are equal. This very gospel makes him say in this very discourse that "My Father is greater than I," 14 J. 28. So how can the greater be equal to the less? Again it is this very John who in his first epistle says 5(1 J.)7 that "there are three that have record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one." How could John make Jesus say that "My Father is greater than I" and at the same time say that the two, as well as the Holy Ghost whom Christ will pray God to send after his death, and who therefore holds a subordinate position to God, being messenger only like Jesus (17 J. 3) are one? It passes one's comprehension. Where did this fisherman of Galilee get all this abstruse Neo Platonic philosophy from? The result was a schism in the church and the Council of Nice settled the quarrel by adopting the doctrine of Trinity, which is still in vogue. So Christianity has been landed into idolatry, as has been ably shewn by Mahomed. The Jews had one God: "Have no other gods before me" 5 Deut. 7, and "Hear O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord," 6 Deut. 4, but the Christians have three. If the three are one and in every respect alike, then why three? If they are different then it is idolatry, a thing hated by all the Shemitics.

Plato considered the divine nature under three heads: 1. the first Cause, 2. Reason or Logos, and the

soul or spirit of the universe. The Logos undisputed
sidered as the Son of an eternal Father tiond by
creator and Governor of the world. Philo an A- his
drian Jew who lived under the reign of Augustus
13) applied the character of the Logos to the Jehovah of
Moses, and the Son of God was introduced upon earth
in a visible and even in a human appearance, to per-
form these familiar offices which seem incompatible
with the nature and attributes of the Universal Cause.
St. John, who wrote in the reign of Nerva, identified
the Logos with Jesus. This is a riddle very difficult
to understand and Gibbon says that Athanasius has
confessed that the more he thought on the divinity of
the Logos, the less he comprehended it. The mea-
ning of this word Logos led to a schism of the Church
and Constantine convened the Council of Nice which
settled the dispute for all time by declaring that the
three godheads are consubstantial or homogeneous
to each other.

CHAPTER 10.

SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY.

So much for the argument for the divine origin of Christianity based on its teachings. Then it is said that this religion spread very rapidly and has civilized mankind and the most advanced people in the world are Christians. I dispute the correctness, of the first part of the proposition, the latter part I do not deny, but I dispute the inference. And all this is advanced as an argument in favour of its divine origin.

Let us divide the 1900 years that have elapsed since Christ's death into three periods, the first ending with the eruption of the barbarians, and the commencement of the Dark Ages, the second ending with the Dark Ages and the Renaissance, and the third ending at the present time.

As to the first period, we do not find any remarkable man of note among the Christian community. There were several Fathers and other ecclesiastical writers, but was there any great Christian writer of note who wrote on any lay subject? The fact is that the Christians were led to believe by the very words of Jesus that salvation was nigh and they were all mad to prepare for it and neglected everything else including belles lettres. Not many years after the conversion of Constantine, the barbarians began to invade the outskirts of the empire and ultimately Italy and then Rome itself, and the Dark Ages commenced. During this period Christianity cannot be said to have made any addition to the material or intellectual progress or civilisation of the world or to have produced a great writer.

That Christianity spread rapidly is an undisputed fact. Christ's name and punishment are mentioned by Tacitus (d: 117) who also speaks of the spread of his religion in Judea and in Rome itself. Pliny (d:113) asks for the advice of Trajan as to how to deal with Christians, Suetonius (Nero cap. 16), Juvenal (d:140, Sat. v. 155) Martial (d : 104) Epictetus (l. IV. c. 7), Marcus Antoninus (d : 180, Med : 1. XI. C. 3.) all mention his name and some of them lived in the first century A. D. Josephus mentions his name and his resurrection (Antiq. book 17, Ch. 3, sec. 3). Gibbon says this passage is an interpolation but Renan differs from him. Polycarp (d : 155) Ignatius Quadratus, (d : 117) Justin Martyr, (d : 163) Irenaeus (d : 202) a disciple of Polycarp, a disciple of John, all mention his name and some of them speak highly of his religion.

Gibbon says that at the time of Constantine's conversion one twentieth of his subjects were Christians but after his conversion he bestowed municipal privileges to cities which destroyed their temples, and promised a white garment and twenty pieces of gold to each convert, and exempted the whole body of Catholic clergy from all service and taxes, and the number of the clergy exceeded that of the legions, and that of the bishops was 1800 and the income of each was 6,000 pounds sterling. He abolished the oracles and the Egyptian priests, and dispoiled the temples of Asia and Greece of their idols and riches. His sons demolished temples, and forbade sacrifices on pain of death. (Code Theodex 1. XVI. tit. X leg 4 and leg 12). Theodosius ordered the demolition of all temples in the empire. This leads Gibbon to observe that "The ruin of Paganism, in the age of Theodosius,

is perhaps the only example of the total extirpation of any ancient and popular superstition, and may therefore deserve to be considered as a singular event in the history of the human mind."

Christianity started with very humble beginnings. Christ was a carpenter, his principal disciples were fishermen and publicans and others of low origin. They were not learned in the proper meaning of the term. St. Paul seems to be the only learned man among the apostles. In the first or second centuries the poor flocked to Christianity and it could not boast of learned disciples. Gibbon enumerates only eight learned men among the early Christians. They were Aristides, Justin Martyr (d. 163), Clemens of Alexandria, Tertullian (d. 230), Julius Africanus, Origen (d. 253), Cyprian (d. 258) and Lactantius the contemporary of Constantine the Great. In fact learning was despised by the early Christians, and Artemon holds up to ridicule the readers of Euclid, Aristotle, Theophrastus and Galen. But the most learned men of these two centuries were all idolators and were not followers of Christianity such as Seneca, the two Plinys, Tacitus, Plutarch, Galen, Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius Antoninus.

Before I conclude this part of the subject, I wish to say something regarding Constantine the Great and Theodosius the Great. Why are they both called Great? Is it for their martial qualities just as Peter and Frederick are called Great, or for some other reason? If it be for the former reason then there were many greater Greats in the history of Rome. Trajan and Marcus Antoninus are not called Great though they were good soldiers and very good men. I suspect the real reason is that one of them

became a convert to Christianity and greatly advanced its cause, and the other by his edicts, abolished idolatry throughout the empire. Else how could Constantine be called Great? Did he not put to death, 1. his father-in-law Maximian, 2. his eldest son Crispus, 3. his wife Fausta and 4. his favourite sister's son, Cæsar Licinius? Can such a man be styled Great? Other people have put to death their sons. The first Brutus put his son to death because he was secretly planning with the banished Tarquins to overthrow the Republic. Peter the Great passed sentence of death upon his son Alexis, and Voltaire says that he died in prison but some historians suspect that he was poisoned or tortured to death. Peter the Great has explained to the world the reasons which induced him to pass the sentence of death, *Vide Vie de Pierre le Grand par Voltaire Pt. 2 c. 10.* But Constantine gives no such explanation and his biographer Eusebius has suppressed all mention of this tragedy. Whatever crimes one may commit does not matter provided he be a devout Christian and spreads his religion by any means fair and foul and he will be called Great. Such was the good sense of the early Christians!

That Christianity owed its rapid progress in the Roman empire to the conversion of Constantine also appears from the fact that it made no progress in countries bordering the Roman empire, excepting among the semi savage barbarians who lived in northern Europe and in Germany. As to these barbarians, they thought that they were doing a good thing by imitating the Romans. But as to the countries in Asia to the east of the Roman empire what do we find? The people of these countries,

from the Tigris to the Pacific Ocean were as highly civilized as the Romans under Constantine. But how many Christians lived in those countries? In China there was not a single Christian. In southern India there were a few members of the Nestorian church, but even today their number is too insignificant. In Northern India there were no Christians. India never persecuted the followers of any religion. Still the religion of Christ never made any impression upon its inhabitants. In Persia also this religion made no progress. In Arabia there were very few Christians. In Armenia this religion was established by force by Gregory the Illuminator about the beginning of the fourth century at the same time that Constantine was spreading it in the Roman empire. This Gregory destroyed the pagan temples and put to death many priests, including some Hindu priests. Some Hindu princes had fled to that country after an unsuccessful rebellion in India and erected some temples in Armenia. Those temples were demolished and the priests put to death. In this way any religion can be spread in any country if the civil power backs it by force of arms. These facts prove that the spread of Christianity in the Roman empire and among the barbarians of the north was not due to the divine nature of the religion but to other causes. No doubt no new religion can spread in a Mahomedan country as apostasy is a capital offence (4 Koran v. 91), but there was no Mahomedan religion before 622 A.D. when the Hijra era commenced. This fact might explain why this religion has not been able to establish any footing in any Mahomedan country, but all countries are not Mahomedan, and what progress has even today been made by Chris-

tianity in Mongolia, China, Burma, India and Ceylon. All this rather tends to prove that Christianity did not spread over the Roman empire on account of its divine origin, but to other causes.

It will be said that outside Europe, America, Australia, and South Africa are also Christian countries. But we know what has become of the aboriginies of these countries. The Inquisition forced the American Indians to become Christians through fear of the stake, the aborigines of Australia have been butchered, except in the Western Territory there are less than two hundred families of aborigines in New Zealand, there are no aborigines in Tasmania as they have been extirpated and there is only a handful of christians in South Africa. The extirpation of the aborigines of those countries was effected by the colonists who pretended to be Christians which shows that the Sermon on the Mount did not stand in the way of these pseudo-Christians where self interest was concerned.

"There is another reason for the progress of Christianity. Mithraism was prevalent in the Roman empire, particularly among the soldiery, and Christianity began gradually to absorb it. A very little enquiry serves to discover that this ancient cult, of which so little is known in our own time, was, during some centuries of the Roman Empire, the most widespread among the religious systems which that empire embraced, that Mithraism was the most nearly universal religion of the western world in those early centuries which we commonly call Christian, the two or three centuries before the fall of imperial Rome. As to this all students are agreed, Religious systems of the World, art Mithraism by John M. Robertson p. 194. He continues that in England

there have been found no monumental signs whatever of any Roman profession of the Christian faith, while monuments in honour of Mithra abound and he gives a list of them. England was a part of the Roman empire from 54 B. C. to 410 A. D. and this shews that Christianity did not make the rapid progress the Christian writers exult over. In the other parts of the Roman world there are various Mithraic monumental remains of the Roman period, and this religion was a thorn in the flesh of the early fathers. "And yet with all this testimony to the vogue of Mithraism in the early Christian centuries, there ensues for a whole era an absolute blank in the knowledge of the matter in Christendom, a thousand years in which the ancient culture seems a forgotten name in Europe." Ibid L. 195, and the first man after the Fathers, who mentions Mithra was Pietro Riccis, born about 1465. This proves the absolute fairness of the monks and the clergy who were formerly the only persons who copied or wrote works on Christianity. These ecclesiastics have gone to the length of destroying all copies of the works of Celsus and Porphyry who wrote against Christianity. Similar instances are found in India. Sanskrit works written by Brahmins are silent as to Buddha and his doctrines though the Vishnu Purana mentions the name of his father Suddhodhana and in the Srimat Bhagavat Purana, Buddha is represented as one of the future incarnations of the god Vishnu who will be born in Behar to bewilder completely the hater of the gods," (Book 1 ch. 3 v. 24) a nice way of saying that he will deceive the wicked and his religion will be a false one. Similarly Sanskrit writings by Brahmins are silent about the existence, virtues and works of

Asoka, because he was not a follower of Brahminism, and these two were the greatest men which India has yet produced. The real reason is that religious bias, the strongest of all kinds of bias, makes men blind to truth and fairness.

Robertson says that many rites and ceremonies were borrowed and legends adopted by the Christians from the Mithraic religion, such as Christmas, sacrifice of the lamb, the birth of Jesus not in an inn as narrated in the gospels but in a cave, as Origen (*Against Celus* 1. 51) and Justin Martyr (*Dialogue with Trypho* 1. 78) explicitly affirm, the holy supper, resurrection, Sunday worship, the Easter tragedy, Jesus being a living stone, 2 (1 Pet.) 4, 5, turning water into wine, which is the celebrated Dionysius wine miracle, *Ibid* p. 210-211. He further says that Mithraism was suppressed by force in Rome and Alexandria p. 211, and he cites Jerome, *Epist. c. VII ad Latam.* Migue XXII col. 869 ; Socrates, *Ec : Hist : B. V, C. 16* in support of his statement.

Robertson gives many other proofs to show that Christianity has copied many ideas from Mithraism. He also says that the latter religion being esoteric very few ignorant people the mass of humanity, could understand its mysteries. Then by degrees Christianity began to absorb it by adopting its myths, such as its mizd or sacred cake in the Christian mass, Apollo the good shepherd became Christ the good shepherd, its mystic rock Petra become Peter, Jesus carrying the lamb on his shoulders like Mithra, Isis became the virgin, the idols became saints. Afterwards by degrees, Mithraism was absorbed and swallowed up by Christianity which from Constantine's conversion began to spread very rapidly.

CHAPTER 11.

CHRISTIANITY IN THE DARK AGES.

During the Dark Ages the whole of Christian Europe was barren of literature and art and made very few discoveries in science. The people of Europe got their knowledge of science from the Saracens who had their Golden Age when Europe was suffering from its Dark Ages. The Romans or rather the Roman Empire had the Augustan Age in the time of Augustus, who died when Jesus was young and the Romans were heathens. The next Augustan Age in Europe occurred in the time of Pope Leo X more than 1500 years after, and the Renaissance had then commenced. There was no Augustan Age elsewhere, except one in the Court of Vikramaditya VI about 570 A. D. and the other in the Court of Al Mamun (813-833) the son of the celebrated Haroun al Raschid, the greatest of the Caliphs. The Saracens who held the lamp of light in those ages literally discovered the science of chemistry and made many great discoveries in it, and also in astronomy, mathematics and medicine, during those ages. They discovered the preparation of alkali, alembic, alcohol and other drugs, taught spherical trigonometry, solved quadratic and cubic equations, introduced algebra and numerals from India, and optics and hydrostatics were investigated. Geber erected the first astronomical observatory at Seville in 1196, and Avicenna, born 980, was the greatest medical authority in those ages.

They made writing paper in Mecca in 706. They either invented or introduced the pendulum and the mariner's compass into Europe, and who has not heard of the damascus blade and the damascene cloth. They claim to have invented gun powder in the eleventh century. In fact, their literature, art, and science form the connecting link between the civilizations of ancient and modern times. To them we owe the revival of learning and philosophy in Western Europe and the first awakening of the critical and enquiring spirit that has roused Europe from monkish lethargy and ecclesiastical bigotry.

In contradistinction to this, what do we find in Europe in the Dark Ages? We find some second rate ecclesiastical bigots and schoolmen. There was a lightening before (a second) death in the reign of Charlemagne, the correspondent and friend of Haroun-al Raschid, in whose court flourished Alcuin and some other writers of repute. As to the schoolmen, they are a laughing stock to the moderns, and Abelard, the greatest of them is known more for his love intrigues with Heloise than for his teachings. Christianity, which was then at its height and held undisputed sway without practically any schism in the whole of Europe during these ages, produced nothing for the moral or intellectual advancement of mankind or its material progress.

The Christians of the Dark Ages condemned the work of Copernicus tortured Galileo the greatest man of his age and the founder of modern astronomy, and suppressed all attempts at discoveries in science.

The Albegensian heresy was suppressed by the Catholics with great cruelty and the Holy Inquisition was started in 1229, and the famous Spanish Inqui-

sition was started in 1232, and began to act vigorously from 1480. Its procedure is described in the *Directorium Inquisitorium* of Eymereich, Inquisitor General of Castille in 1356. The accusers and the judges were the same persons and the riches of the condemned became the property of the Inquisition. Even the lawyer for the accused was selected by it. According to Llorente the Spanish Inquisition up to 1809, when Napoleon suppressed it, burnt alive 31,912 men, in effigy 17,659, and imprisoned 341,021.

Prescott says that those who left Spain were not permitted by Ferdinand to take any silver with them, and that those who crossed over to the Barbary States were made slaves if men, or became inmates of the seraglio, if females. It must not be supposed that the Inquisition is quite dead. Gore in his *Scientific Basis of Morality* p. 426 mentions a case of the burning of ten heretics in Mexico in the year 1895.

The spirit of the Inquisition appeared also in England where "between the years 1530 and 1603 two hundred thousand Englishmen were starved, executed, punished and imprisoned for their adherence to the old faith, Catholicism." F. Molloy, *Faiths of the Peoples*, 1892 Vol. I. p. 26.

It might be naturally expected that Christians would tolerate every form of belief. But the reverse was the rule. They suppressed the Arian heresy, the Albigenian heresy, and the Protestant heresy and the Protestants of England suppressed the Catholic heresy. In the time of Elizabeth, Acts were passed to compel people to attend Protestant churches every Sunday, and fine and imprisonment were the punishments for not obeying the law. In the time of Charles II an Act of Uniformity was passed with

the same object, which prescribed similar penalties for non-attendance in Protestant churches on Sundays. The object of these Acts was to compel Catholics to attend Protestant churches and the Dissenters to attend the churches of the Established Church. Historically the Christians were the first to prosecute heretics and to force their religion on any one and their example was followed by others. The Greeks, the Romans, the Hindus, Buddhists and Parsees did not force any man to follow their religion by fear of death or torture, and the example was first set by the followers of one of the meekest and loving of men. Such is the nature of man !

I do not wish to say much on this sickening subject. I only wish to ask all Christians whence they got this sort of putting a man to death. There were satis in India, which survived from ancient times. The wife was expected to serve her departed lord in the next world and there she accompanied him as early as possible. But all this was with the consent of the wife. Bernier, who gives a long list of cases of sati which he witnessed, does not say that there was any force used to compel the wife to ascend the funeral pyre. Public opinion, religious zeal and conjugal love induced the half dazed wife to go to seek and serve her departed husband. As cremation was the only form of disposal of the dead, the wife had no choice of the form of death. I do not support sati. It was a mad idea, but still there was no force used in it. Could not the divines, who thus played with human lives, the highest and the most invaluable thing on earth, devise any other form of punishment or of death ? The New Testament unlike the Old does not enjoin the killing of heretics and it nowhere

speaks of fire except in connection with hell. Where, brother Christians, did you find this horrible form of death? Hanging, beheading, poisoning or shooting were more merciful forms of death. But why did you burn members of your own species when you knew that it was the most horrible and cruel form of putting a man to death? I have nowhere found an answer to this question. If Jesus was a God with a capital G, know that we are all gods with a small g, and should worship one another. I suspect this form of punishment was copied from what the cruel Nero did to the first batch of Nazarenes whom he considered as rebels, not acknowledging his supreme authority or divinity. The object may also have been to prevent resurrection by reducing a man to ashes.

Remember always the golden rule laid down by all the great teachers of religion, from Laotze in China on the extreme east of Asia to Jessus Christ in Palestine, on the extreme west, that rule which is not only a rule of religion but also a rule of practical utility. That rule, embodied in the Sermon on the Mount (7 Mat. 12), says "therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you do ye even so them : for this is the law and the prophets" better expressed in 6 L. 31 : "And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise." Would Cardinal Ximenes, who burnt so many men, would he have liked to be burnt? If not, he should not have burnt any fellow being.

As regards the state of society during the Dark Ages, I would refer the reader to a book on the state of German Society at the close of the Middle Ages by Belford Bax where the cruelties practised by the rich upon the poor are fully narrated.

CHAPTER 12.

MODERN CHRISTIANITY.

The third and the most important epoch commences from the end of the Dark Ages and the commencement of the Renaissance. As to when the Dark Ages end there is a slight difference of opinion among historians. Some are of opinion that they ended with the final defeat of the Greeks by the Mahomedans ending in the capture of Constantinople in 1453. Hallam ends his History of the Middle Ages with the invasion of Italy by Charles VIII of France in 1498. For my purpose either of these two years may be taken as the end of the Middle Ages, otherwise called the Dark Ages, though I would prefer Hallam's opinion.

It is said that the Reformation has changed the face of the world. But this argument is fallacious. The larger part of Christendom is still Roman Catholic, but the people of those countries are equally civilized as those of the countries professing the reformed religion. So the two religions make no difference in the civilization of any country. Further, France was the most enlightened country just before the Revolution, and Voltaire is the greatest literary figure in modern times. Voltaire was not a Christian, and France in the time of the Encyclopaedists was more or less atheistic. So religion had nothing to do with its pre-eminence. Similarly Erasmus was the personification of the Humanist movement as the new movement was called, and the whole intellectual movement of the time centred round him, and Belfort Bax says that "the men of the humanist movement

were for the most part freethinkers, and it was with them that free thought first appeared in modern Europe." German Society p. 102-3. Thus we may safely say that the salvation of Europe is due to the humanist movement, and the causes before mentioned and other causes, such as the advance in science, and not to religion, Christian or pagan.

Modern Christianity differs from that of the Dark Ages in the Reformation of the Church. But southern Europe and Austria are still Catholic and there are many Catholics in Protestant countries. Has this Reformation changed the character of the men? There is no difference between the Catholics and Protestants of Europe and America in all matters except belief in one or two dogmas, which do not change the character of men. If the Catholics had their Inquisition, the Protestants had their own laws against the Dissenters, and the greatest blot upon Christianity is not the Inquisition but the Negro slavery by Catholics and Protestants practised alike, and which was suppressed only in 1865 after a bloody civil war.

All Christians, including Luther, believed in devils appearing before men and in witchcraft, and ghosts. Luther lived in the sixteenth century but Shakespeare and Milton lived in the seventeenth, and the last trial for witchcraft in England took place in the early eighteenth century, when Chief Justice Holt exposed its baselessness (Campbell's *Lives of the Chief Justices*, Vol. 3 p. 5). Even Wesley the founder of Methodism, who died in 1791, said that "unless witchcraft is true, nothing in the Bible is true." (A. D. White, *the Warfare of Science and Theology* Vol. 1 p. 148).

Even in civilized England Christianity did very little. In 1901 some eminent lawyers delivered a course of lectures. They were published under the title of *A Century of Law Reform*. It says that in 1801 there were 200 capital offences, and points out many defects in the criminal law, which shows that England was not much civilized in the eighteenth century. The laws relating to women and to strikes of labourers have recently been improved, but Lord Asquith wished in this century to throw the Suffragettes into the sea. Even now there is no country which gives women the position which Plato would have given to them in his ideal Republic where they were permitted to follow other than domestic and family functions. "The only difference admissible between men and women in the joint discharge of the functions of Guardians is that the easier portions of such functions must in general be assigned to women, and the more difficult to men, in consequence of the inferiority of the feminine nature." *Grotes Plato Vol. 3 p. 68*. The communion of sexes must be kept up for the duties of the Guardians, and for the exigencies for military defence p. 72. "What has been said about the male Guardians and philosophers must be understood to apply equally to the female. We recognise no difference in this respect between the two sexes." p. 104. "The Guardians will consist both of men and women. The women will receive the same training, both musical and gymnastical, as the men. They will take part both in the bodily exercises of the palæstra, in the military drill, and in combats of the war." p. 67.

Are we to presume that England was more Christian and therefore more civilized in 1801 than in 1901?

The argument ought to have led us to that conclusion for there can be no doubt that in the nineteenth century the English people were more devout Christians than their descendants of the twentieth century. Formerly every body of importance attended church on Sundays, but now the churches are more or less empty. The advance of science has been the cause of the decay of the religious spirit in England, and now more than half the educated people do not believe that the earth and the starry heavens with all their contents were created in the course of six days, or rather five and half days, from Sunday morning to Friday evening, when the Sabbath commenced, and God had to take rest after his immense labour, though the Bible is silent as to how long His sabbath continued and when He broke it. Now how many educated people in England have any faith in this story, and in the great calamity which fell upon Adam and his latest posterity consequent on his delinquency, for which he was capitally punished and for which his latest posterity will be capitally punished some time or other in their lives including the progeny of all other living beings, though no explanation is found in the Bible as to why my horse died the other day as its ancestor never ate the fruit of the forbidden tree. According to Christianity Christ came to redeem us from the effects of that original sin, though it has still remained a capital offence, and all men and with them all sentient beings will have to be capitally punished someday in their lives.

Europeans call themselves highly civilized. What have they done to the heathens and to each other? Europeans settled in newly discovered countries, such as America, Australia, New Zealand and Tasmania

have decimated the people by the aid of fire arms. Cortez landed in Mexico and slaughtered the innocent Aztecs in 1514. Pizzaro put Montezuma and the Mexicans to death. So this is to the credit of modern Christianity, which says "love thy neighbour as thyself." The introduction of opium in China at the point of the bayonet, the introduction of spirits in newly discovered countries which have almost decimated the people, were events which happened less than a century ago. The highly civilized Christians of America have always treated the aborigines very harshly. They were till the other day denied the rights of citizenship, as it was only in 1924 that they were admitted as citizens of the United States. And what was their number then? The total number was found to be 350,000, whereas the population of the country at the last census exceeded 105,000,000.

Jesus does not mention the word slavery though there were plenty of slaves in Judea. His silence is inexplicable. Paul sends a deserter slave Onesimus to his master Philemon with a letter of recommendation. Philemon 10-18. I don't wish to say much on slavery except to observe that it existed in all Christian countries. In England the slaves were known as serfs even in the fourteenth century. As regards Negro slavery it appears that in 1662 Charles II chartered a company for carrying on this trade, the company being bound to land at least 3000 slaves every year and the English Parliament declared the trade to be "highly beneficial and advantageous to the kingdom and to the plantations and colonies thereunto belonging." Spears, the author of the American Slave Trade, gives some instances of several hundred Negros being bound two together and thrown into

the sea to escape capture of the slaver. For detailed information on this sickening subject I refer the reader to that book. Even after the abolition of the Negro slavery, the Negroes are treated as helots in America. And the Americans are Christians and the most prosperous and civilized nation on earth. The fact is that no religion, however good, can change the selfish and cruel nature of man. The last World War proves my theory. What cruelties were not inflicted upon the Allies by the civilized Protestant Germans.

The real fact is that the Renaissance of the sixteenth century and not Christianity which had been existing since 1500 years, civilized mankind. The Encyclopædists of France, who were not Christians, opened the intellectual eyes of Europe and the scientists whose discoveries disproved the biblical theory of man's descent and the doctrine of original sin, in other words who disproved the judaising basis of Christianity, have materially assisted in civilizing man. Science was suppressed by the Christianity of the Dark Ages, when it was most powerful, but with the decline of Christianity since the last two centuries, science and knowledge have advanced immensely and man is rapidly advancing in civilization, though his nature has not much changed.

It is an axiomatic truth that the state of the law of a country, ecclesiastical or civil, is an index to its civilization. If that be so then there is no country on earth, Christian or heathen, which can be called civilized. The laws of every country are partial to one class or other, if not sometimes positively cruel. When law will have no regard to creed, colour, nationality, sex, poverty, or other accidents of birth,

then only can it claim to be called the law of a civilized country. The agriculturist toils in sunshine and rain, and he gets a pittance for all his trouble and lives in a hut, and we landlords sit on armchairs in our buildings and fatten on his labour. When law will make all men and women equal in its eye then only will it be the law of a civilized country, and not till then. And no Christian, Mahomedan, Buddhist, or Hindu country has yet come up to that ideal. So abolish all distinctions of religion, as they have done very little good and have accentuated the difference between the classes and insist on an equal heritage and brotherhood of man and of the whole human race, man and woman. That ought to be the goal of every religion. Most religions point the finger to an unknown future forgetting that there is the living present before us. So first ameliorate the condition of the living, and if you have leisure think of the future destiny of man on earth, and if time hangs heavily on you, think, if you like, of what your reward will be in an imaginary heaven.

The Hindu religion enjoins the giving of alms to the poor, and every householder must give a handful of rice to every beggar who wants it, and it is a sin to refuse alms to a beggar. Rich Hindus have guest houses where every wayfarer can lodge and have one meal. The rich Hindus give feasts to the poor besides some monetary gifts and clothing on every important ceremonial occasion, such as births, marriages and deaths. Buddha also enjoined the giving of alms, and his monks are called Bhikshus, from bhiksha, begging. He ordered all his lay followers to give one fortieth of their income to the poor. The Jews were ordered to give alms to the poor. Every third year each pro-

priotor had to share the tithes of his produce with "the Levite, the stranger, the fatherless and the widow". After the captivity there were in every city three official collectors of alms, the giving of which was enforced under penalties. The Pharisees were zealous in alms giving and were rebuked by Jesus, who said "but when thou doest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth, that thine alms may be in secret". 6 Mat. 1-4. The Koran places a high value upon the giving of alms, and Mahomed enjoined it: "observe prayer and pay the legal alms Koran ch. 2 v. 105. See also ch. 2, v. 211, ch. 30 v. 38, ch. 58 v. 13, 14, ch. 64, v. 16-17 in which he says the gift to the poor will be doubled in heaven. Jesus also enjoined the giving of alms to the poor. In 6 Mat. 1-4 he rebukes the giving of alms in public, but in 14 L. 13 he says, "when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind". I do not know much about stay at home Europeans but as far as I know, Europeans who live in India deprecate the giving of alms to beggars, and begging is penalised in England. They have work houses for vagrants, and pensions are given to old people. As far as I know, no feasts are given to the poor by Europeans in India. Even in matters of public charity it is very rare to find any European spending money after the good of the Indian public. Some of them have left bequests for the education of christians, but they rarely endow any work of public charity. What they do is mostly communal. Not one of them has endowed any chair in any Indian University or given any legacy to the Indian public. This shows that they do not follow the precepts of christ though they call themselves Christians. As to giving of

alms to beggars, they are dead against it. The Jains and Hindus have erected dharmasalas in many places where travellers can lodge without any payment and they have annachhatras where poor people are daily fed. Christians give to their religious institutions just as Hindus give, but what Christian organisation exists in India for the relief of the Indian poor? The fact is that very few Christians really follow the precepts of Christ in this matter. They think that they have been baptised and they believe in christ, so their salvation is assured, and they now worship not christ but Mammon. In this matter of giving alms to the poor or relieving their distress I must give my preference to Hindus and Mahomedans and above all to Jains and Buddhists.

Jesus never touched upon politics except in one place when he said "render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's." So I shall avoid politics except to say a word as to the 'Caesars' of Russia. I suppose Russia was a christian country during the regime of the Tsars which lasted till 1917. And what was that regime? Nitti the ex-premier of Italy says in his Bolshevism, Fascism and Democracy p. 68, that the Tsarist regime "was one of the most wicked and cruel tyrannies known to history". I could have said more of the politics of christian countries, but like Christ I avoid the subject and leave it to the imagination of my readers.

CHAPTER 13.

CHRIST'S RELIGION.

Christ never called himself God. His apostles and followers, specially Paul have deified him as they very strongly held the expectation of the Messiah and as Christ was a superman, they took him to be the Messiah. There are many references in the old Testament to the Messiah the Hebrew equivalent of the Greek word Christ (anointed). The promise of Messiah is commonly held to appear first in 3 Gen. 16. where God promises to put enmity between the serpent's seed and man's seed. The word itself is found in 9 Dan. 25, 26. But the priests were also anointed. 4 Lev. 3, 5, 6 Lev. 22. The New Testament having been written in Greek, instead of Messiah, we find the word Christ used in it more than 650 times. The Messiah was promised to Abraham and his seed, 12 Gen. 3, 18 Gen 18, 22 Gen. 18, to Moses as the coming prophet, 18 Deut. 15, 18. The devout find many other references to the Messiah, such as 68 Psalm 18, and Psalm 117, which is an exhortation to all nations to praise God. It is on this slender basis that Jesus is called Christ, the promised Messiah. One is tempted to say that the wish is father to the thought. Even if it were conceded that God promised the Messiah to Abraham, Moses and others, still that Messiah was for the Jews, and the Gentiles have nothing to do with him. It is for this reason that Jesus is in many places supposed to have come to deliver his people 1 L. 77, and redeem Israel 24 L. 21, 1 Acts. 6, from the hand of 'our enemies',

1 L. 74. And this Messiah will reign for ever 1 L. 33, 22 J. 34. 110 Psalm 4, 8 Isai 5, 7 Dan. 25, 26, while we all know that Jesus never delivered his country from 'our' enemies, and his reign never commenced over Judea or the Jews and so the question does not arise whether it will ever end.

The religion of Christ was not what modern Christianity is. It was originally a great departure from Judaism. The Jews based their religion on the Pentateuch, the principal dogmas of which were the necessity of circumcision upon which God based his covenant with Abraham, 17 Gen. 10, and the observance of the Sabbath, twice ordained by God 31 Ex. 13 and 19 Lev. 30, and God was so strict upon this matter that he ordered Moses to put a poor man to death for gathering sticks for fuel on a Sabbath day and the order was carried out 15 Num. 32-36. But Jesus is silent as to circumcision and he allowed his apostles to break the Sabbath by plucking and eating corn on that day in his very presence, and when the Pharisees objected to this Jesus said that the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath, and called himself the lord of the Sabbath. 12 Mat. 1-8. He also cured a blind man on a Sabbath day 9 J 14. These two principal injunctions of the God of the Jews in the Mosaic law Jesus either did not enjoin on his disciples or wilfully broke. The Jews had many priests and attendants of the Temple. The Levites, to the number of 24,000, served in the Temple, there were 6000 officers, 4000 porters, and 4000 musicians to praise God, 23 (1 Chro.) 3-5. Jesus never ordained any priest, but priesthood has come back and every church in every city can count many priests. As Jesus had no priests

he had no ceremonials, as everybody knows that priests were made for ceremonials and ceremonials for the priests. If anybody doubts this let him come and reside in a Bengal village for six months and he will no longer doubt. Jesus had no rituals except baptism which he himself did not perform but left this duty to his disciples 4 J. 2. In many of these matters Jesus did what Buddha had done. Buddha abolished ceremonials, rituals and priest craft, and established a religion of the heart and the love of one's neighbour. Jesus forsook the tribal God of the Jews, whom Moses portrays as a cruel and revengeful Deity, for a loving Father. As already stated the Father in heaven was an Aryan expression and the Lords prayer addressed by Jesus had existed in many Aryan religions. The Pharisee Hillel had introduced a benevolent Father after the example of the Greeks and Persians, and Jesus, who was ten years old when Hillel died, got this idea from him. Elsewhere in Alexanderia, Philo a contemporary of Jesus and other Neo-platonists had at the same time preached the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God and of the only begotten Sonship of the Logos, which is copied in the opening verses of John.

The Messiah, as previously stated was expected to be the deliverer of the chosen people of God from their temporal subjection. The Messiah or Christ was not expected to be a spiritual deliverer of the Jews or of any people. Such was the Jewish expectation of the Messiah, 24 L. 21, 1 A. 6. The Christian idea of spiritual Saviour is taken from the Zoraastrian idea of the coming Messiah Soshiyanta, who according to the promise of Ahura Mazda would appear on the day of judgment, destroy the evil influence of Ahriman

and renovate the world. This idea was accepted by the Pharisees, while the Sadducees did not believe in any hereafter. The Ideas of the last day which was expected soon, judgment and renovation of mankind by casting the wicked into hell for ever, including the ideas of the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the dead, the salvation of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked, and also the ideas of heaven, hell Satan, and angels he got from the Persians. He took the idea of the kingdom of heaven from the Buddhistic idea of a kingdom of heaven, of love, peace and justice.

Hellenic learning was widely prevalent in Western Asia, and the Jews were for fifty years captives in Babylon where they also imbibed many Zoroastrian ideas, and Buddhism had spread as far as Western Asia. Al Biruni, a companion of Mahomed of Gazni, circa 1000, says that it had spread in those countries, but the Persian monarch stopped its progress. So there is no improbability in Jesus taking his ideas from every one of these sources. This Buddhistic idea of a kingdom of love and peace had been preached in Syria and Palestine by Buddhist monks two hundred years before Christ. The Essenes were practically Buddhists. They had, like the Buddhist monks, community of goods and elected governors, praise of poverty and celibacy, holy washings and meal times, avoidance of meat and wine and restriction to a strict vegetarian diet, a code of ethics inculcating brotherly love and charity. The existence of this sect among the Israelites shows to what extent Buddhism had spread in Israel. The Egyptian branch of the Essenes was called Therapeutists as the Buddhists were also called, from Therapeutia, a Pali form of the

Sanskrit word *sthiraputra*, meaning son of *Sthira* or *Thera*, one who is serene, enlightened and undisturbed by the world. This was one of Buddha's names. These people were reputed to be able to cure disease.

Asoka, the grandson of Chandra Gupta, the contemporary and son-in-law of Seleucus, after his conversion to Buddhism about 247 B. C. sent missionaries in all directions to preach the religion of Buddha. He was so zealous in this matter that he sent his son Prince Mahinda and daughter Sangamitta to Ceylon for this purpose. His missionaries went to all countries, from Siberia to Ceylon and from China to Egypt in which last country the Christians had the first Christian monk Antony according to Gibbon VI. Ch. 37 p. 229 which institution must have been copied from the Buddhists. Asoka's stone edicts mention five Greek kings who were his contemporaries, Antiochus of Syria, Ptolemaos of Egypt, Antigonus of Macedon, Magas of Cyrene and Alexander of Epiras. The edict says that Asoka had made treaties with them and sent Buddhist missionaries to their kingdoms to preach the religion of Buddha. "Both here and in foreign countries" says Asoka, "everywhere the people follow the religion of the Beloved of the gods wheresoever it reacheth." Mahaffy, the Christian historian, says, "the Buddhist missionaries preached in Syria two centuries before the teaching of Christ which has so much in common, was heard in northern Palestine.

These missionaries preached the doctrine of love, peace and justice through parables without being backed by the civil power or the sword and made many converts. Philo, the Alexandrian Neo-Platonist, the contemporary of Jesus mentions the Indian

Gymnasophists, or Buddhists. The Essenes, whose Egyptian branch was called the Therapeutists numbered four thousand according to Philo. Pliny says "The Essenes live on the western shore of the Dead sea" (home of Christ). "They are a hermit clan, one marvellous beyond all others in the world, without any woman, without the joys of domestic life, and the associates of palm trees." Josephus also speaks highly of the Essenes.

These Essenes had holy washings, and Jesus took the rite of baptism from them or rather John the Baptist did it. Like the Buddhist, the Essenes rose before sunrise and had their prayers in the early morning with the face towards the East. When the day broke they went to work. Agriculture and other peaceful trades were their ordinary occupations, in which they remained till 11 A. M. when they took a bath, put on white linen and ate a purely vegetable diet, and never tasted any meat, fish or wine. Like the Buddhist monks they wore leather aprons. Before entering their order, they had to promise that they would lead a righteous life, be faithful, love truth always, never steal or make any unholy gain.

Renan says that the "Essenes resembled the Gurus (spiritual masters) or Brahmanism." He asks "might there not in this be a remote influence of the Mounis" (holy saints of India who vow silence)? He says "Babylon had become for sometimes a true focus of Buddhism. Boudasp (Boddhisatta), another name of Buddha, was reputed a wise Chaldean and the founder of Sabaism, which means, as its etymology indicates, baptism." Renan also says, "we may believe, at all events, that many of the external practices of John, of the Jewish spiritual teachers of the time were

derived from influences then but recently received from the far East," meaning India. Thus Jesus was influenced by Buddhism through the Essenes and John the Baptist.

In many respects the religion of Christ follows Buddhism. For instance, he, like Buddha, preached purity, charity, self-denial, control of passions, honesty, faith, forgiveness and love of enemies. The Bhagavad Geeta also enjoins purity, self denial, control of passions and renunciation, forgiveness and love of enemies, doing good to others without expectation of reward, So Christ followed Buddhism and the religion of the Geeta. Buddha did not believe in the existence of the individual or the universal soul, which Christ and the Geeta taught. In the Geeta Krishna says "I am the path. Follow me and worship one God. I existed before the world was created. I am the Lord of all (I and my Father are one 10 J. 30, I am the true vine 15 J. 1.). Giving up the formalities of religion, come unto me, follow me, take refuge in me. I shall free thee from sins and give eternal peace unto thee." Here one is compelled to observe a distinction. Christ and Buddha followed what they preached. One was poor and the other forsook a kingdom and both were celibates. But Krishna did not follow what he preached. He became a king and remained so till his death. He joined in battles and strifes and was a much-married man as according to the Srimadva-gavata (Bk. I. Ch. 14 V. 37) he had 16000 wives besides the milkmaids and Radha their Chief. The other ideas of Christ, about Satan and the angels, last day, final judgment, hell and heaven, he got from a Persian source, as already stated.

In some minor incidents also in the lives of

Buddha and Jesus there is great correspondence. Buddha left his home to seek truth when he was thirty years old. Jesus began to preach when he was of the same age. After his enlightenment Buddha fasted forty days. So did Christ after his baptism. After his forty days' fast Buddha was tempted by Mara. So was Jesus tempted by Satan after his forty days' fast. Buddha sent sixty disciples in all directions to preach his religion. So also Jesus, according to Luke, sent his seventy disciples to preach his religion. Is all this coincidence accidental? Excepting the doctrine of the existence of soul, of God and of resurrection, there is very little difference between the Buddhistic and the Christian faiths. The old Jewish religion did not acknowledge the existence of the soul and of a hereafter or resurrection and judgment. These doctrines Jesus or his immediate predecessors borrowed from the Persians. I therefore suspect that Jesus had been to India or some other Buddhistic country before he began his mission, and there learnt many of the doctrines of Buddhism, and he was with the exceptions above noted, a follower of Buddhism, though he did not acknowledge the source of his doctrines which were either Indian or Persian.

The religion of Christ which was pure deism or monotheism with a merciful and not revengeful God has been perverted by Paul and the other apostles who have raised him to the level of God. Christ had no education in the proper sense of the word, but Paul was a highly educated man and the writer of the last Gospel was versed in the Neo Platonic philosophy which he probably got from Philo, who was a contemporary of Jesus. The introduction of philosophy has spoiled the pure religion of Christ and

subsequently all nice questions of philosophy arose in the bosom of the church, such as the conception of Mary, the Franciscans saying she was not conceived in original sin, the Dominicans holding the contrary view, the doctrine of Trinity, that of the Eucharist, and many other matters, so that there are more than seventy two known sects among the Christians. (Sales Koran Prem. Discourse p. 122.) and they fought with one another more like wild beasts than sober men. I purposely say wild beasts as Motley says that a Spaniard cut out the heart of a fallen Dutch enemy and gave it a bite, and the heart has been preserved in spirits of wine in the Museum of Amsterdam and the marks of the teeth are still visible.

The God of the Jews was not a merciful being and existed only for the Jews whom he favoured. The God of Jesus was a merciful being and existed for Jews and Gentile alike, though he never expressly said so. After his death his Jewish apostles began to judaize his religion and based it on the original sin of Adam, and the doctrine of redemption through Jesus slipped in. I wish Jesus had cut off all connection with the Mosaic law and everything connected with the God of the Jews. Instead of that he said that "one jot or tittle of the law will not pass." So Christ was partially responsible for judaizing his religion. This he did to please his countrymen, as this passage occurs in the Sermon on the Mount, his first formal Sermon. He should have also declared his own position in unequivocal terms. If he was God he should have said so, like Krishna in the Gita, or, if a mere man, then he should have said so like Mahomed in the Koran. In Chs. 3, 17, 18 he says he was "only a man as ye are" and that he was "no more than an apostle."

Jesus should have also said what the Holy Ghost was. Herein Mahomed far surpasses him. There is no other claimant to Godhead besides God in the whole Koran, while the Bible has led people to believe that there are three Gods including Jesus himself. This I regard as the greatest blot in the New Testament. From a moral standpoint Christianity is better than Mahomedanism but from a theological point of view the latter is far better than Christianity, which has led its followers to worship the Virgin Mary, the three Godheads and innumerable saints and ikons. Christianity should be divested of the doctrine of the Trinity and the doctrine of eternal punishment in hell fire before it can aspire to be an universal religion.

As to this last matter Hinduism and Buddhism are far better than Christianity and Mahomedanism. The last two condemn men to eternal hell for non-belief in the dogmas of these religions and Christianity has gone so far as to condemn all people who do not believe in Christ's divinity (16 Mk. 16). I fail to see why I should go to hell for eternity for an error of judgment committed in a life which rarely exceeds a century. Herein the two Shemetic religions are not based on reason. But the two Indian religions would punish a man for errors committed in this short life of ours by punishing him in another short life which will follow after the present one, and so on, till he enters into a state of Nirvana, or be extinct. Nirvana is for all sentient beings not Hindus and Buddhists only, and herein the two Indian religions are far better than the two Shemetic religions. The first two make a man work out his own salvation, but the other two religions, without giving him time to reconsider his opinion and admit his error in a subsequent life at

once condemns him for ever to hell for his unbelief after keeping him in the bosom of the earth for a few years, his condition during this interregnum being left to mere conjecture, whereas the Indian religions give him a new body at once and send him on a future course of life to amend the errors of a past life. There can be no doubt that this theory of the Hindus and Buddhists is more reasonable and more humane than that of the two Shemetic religions. Again as between these two last religions one holds out a definite hope of sensual pleasures in paradise (Koran Ch. 55) which may or may not fructify, but Christianity is totally silent upon the state of the blest, the only saying of Christ upon this point being in 22 L. 30, wherein he holds out to the apostles the hope that they "will eat and drink at my table in my kingdom." Are eating and drinking all that the blessed will enjoy in paradise? If so let there be no heaven for the blessed. Mahomed holds out other hopes besides eating and drinking, but Jesus being a bachelor did not hold out the hope of the enjoyment of other sensual pleasures. These are all errors or omissions which his apostles have not tried to correct or fill up, and I believe no Christian writer has said anything about the doings of the blessed after the trial of the last day is over. What will they do in heaven, will they enjoy pleasures there, and if so of what kind, sensual, or spiritual, or both, as here and will those last for ever?

One other omission I wish to point out. The two Indian religions have put all sentient beings on a par as regards the mode of getting salvation. A man after his death may be born a bird or a beast, or vice versa. The Koran speaks of animals at the last day as already stated (6 Koran 39) but Jesus totally

ignored their existence. He spoke of fishes only and that for his food and that again on his last visit to the apostles after his resurrection (21 J. 10). He says not a word about beasts and other animals, and the whole of Christian literature has totally ignored the subject. The fact is that the religion of Christ is not a religion complete in itself but is based on some disjointed and sometimes contradictory sayings, upon which his disciples have tried to formulate a religion based on his divinity, necessitated by the unscientific doctrine of the Original Sin to expiate which for all of us Jesus came down from heaven to be crucified.

Jesus took many of his leading ideas from the Old Testament which he followed as appears from his saying "think not that I am come to destroy the law and the prophets, I am not come to destroy but to fulfil." 5 Mat. 17. He said "love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, 22 Mat. 37, 12 Mk. 30, 21 L. 27. This saying he took from 6 Deut. 5 "thou shalt serve the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul and with all thy might." He said "the kingdom of heaven is at hand" 10 Mat. 7. This is taken from 13 Isai. 6, "the day of the Lord is at hand." He said "the sun will be darkened and the moon will not give her light, and the stars of heaven shall fall and the powers that are in heaven shall be shaken." 24 Mat. 29, 13 Mk. 24-25, 21 L. 25-26. This is taken from 13 Isai. 10 "the stars of heaven and the constellations thereof shall not give their light, the sun shall be darkened in his going forth, and the moon shall not cause her light to shine" and verse 13 "I will shake the heavens and the earth shall remove out of her place." He said that on the Last Day "they shall see the Son of Man coming in

the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." 24 Mat. 30, 13 Mk. 27, 21 L. 27. This idea he took from 7 Dan. 13. "one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven," and 7 Dan. 14, "and there was given him dominion and glory and a kingdom..... his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." These and other borrowings from some of the leading ideas in the law and the prophets, shows that there is very little new in the ideas of love of God and of the neighbour, the nearness of the kingdom of God, and the end of the world, which induced many people to lose no time in getting baptised and becoming his followers. The ideas as to resurrection and the trial on the Last Day, and of hell and heaven he borrowed from the Persians, but he makes himself the judge on that day, 25 Mat. 34, 41, though in one place he says "I come not to judge the world, but to save the world." 12 J. 47, and in another place he said to his twelve apostles "ye shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel," 19 Mat 28, 22 L. 30, thus omitting all reference to other nations as to whose fate the narration leaves everything uncertain. But John in 20 Rev. 12, 13 gets over all these inconsistencies and difficulties by saying that God will judge all men according to their works.

He also took many of his ideas from his countrymen and from outsiders. For instance the ideas of heaven, hell and Satan he got from his countrymen who had got them from the Persians. Most of his ideas in the Sermon on the Mount he got from the Buddhists who had spread their religion to the remotest corners of Western Asia. The idea as to

immortality of the soul was not known to the primitive Jews. God said "I am a jealous God visiting the iniquity of fathers to the third or fourth generation of them that hate me." 5 Deut. 9. From a physical point of view this is correct as the science of Eugenics says that heredity goes as far as the third or fourth generation. But from a moral point of view, each man suffers for his own works. That is the dogma of every religion. The Hindus and Buddhists call it the law of karma, and Jesus also says that a man's faith or belief in him will lead him to heaven 16 Mark 16. Elsewhere he says that the elect will be saved and the rest will "go away into everlasting punishment but the righteous into life eternal." 25 Mat. 46. So a man will be rewarded or punished for his charity in doing good to others or the want of charity. This last idea he got from the Pharisees, as appears from Josephus, de Bell, lib 2 C 8, sec. 14; "They (the Pharisees) believe every soul to be immortal, but that the soul of the wicked is punished with eternal punishment." The first part of the belief is, I suspect, taken from the Buddhists. As to the Sadducees Josephus says that, "it is the opinion of the Sadducees that souls perish with the bodies" Antiq, lib, 18 cl. sec. 4. The Bible also says the same thing, regarding the Sadducees, 22 Mat. 23, 12 Mk. 18, 20 L. 27. the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection. Jesus, in this matter, followed the belief of the multitude, as it appears from Josephus, Antiq lib 13 ch. 10, sec. 6, that the Sadducees influence none but the rich, and have not the populace on their side, but the Pharisees have the multitude to back them." Considering these and other things, one is bound to come to the conclusion that there is not much of originality in the ideas

of Jesus, though he has called some of the choicest fruits from his predecessors' gardens.

I am sorry that the beautiful religion of Christ enunciated in the Sermon on the Mount and his other sayings, has been left in the background and his followers are caring more for his divinity than for the religion he preached. Cannot man be saved, if salvation there be, except through belief in Christ's divinity? In that case idiots, lunatics, and infants who die young can never be saved, though idiocy is always, and lunacy is often congenital, for which the idiot and the lunatic are not responsible and every man is bound to be an infant once in his life. This divinity of Christ and salvation only through belief in his divinity for which the apocryphal verse¹⁶ Mark 16 is mainly responsible appear to be the greatest blot in Christianity which pretends to be but is not the religion of Christ but is really the religion of Paul and some other followers of Christ. If there be such a thing as salvation, all men and the whole animated nature will get it and ought to get it.

Jesus never said a word against the use of intoxicants or gambling. Indeed his first miracle was the turning of water into wine at a marriage feast when his mother complained of want of wine. 2-J 1-11. In his last supper he gave a piece of bread to each of his disciples to eat and said it was his flesh and he gave a cup of wine to each of them and told them to drink it saying it is his blood. 26 Mat. 27-28, 14 Mk 23-24, 22 L. 20. This sacramental ceremony is performed by all Christians except the Protestants. But Buddha enunciated the Noble Eightfold Paths, one of which was Right Conduct which included the avoidance of drinking intoxicants. Arya Dharma of Dharmapal

page 217. Gambling, games, dicing, were also prohibited. Tevigga Sutta Ch. 2 V. 4 in Vol. XI of Secred Books of the East. page 193. Mahomed expressly prohibits wine and games of chance. Koran Ch. 2 v. 216 Ch. 5 v. 93. The early Aryans were fond of wine and out of the 10 Mandalas in the Rig Veda, the oldest of the Vedas, an entire Mandala consisting of 114 hymns, viz., No. 9, is, with the exception of one hymn devoted to the praise of Soma, the fermented liquor produced from the juice of the soma plant. In Mandala 9 hymn 96 verses 5 and 6 the God Soma is called the Father of the Holy Hymns (Rig Veda) and of Earth, Heaven, Agni, Sun and of Vishnu, and is described as the Brahman of the gods. There are also constant references to it in the other Mandalas. The reason of all this is that the early Aryans were fond of wine and as they had large herds of cattle they ate beef in plenty. Vide the chapter on Beef in Ancient India in Dr. Rajendra Lala Mitra's Indo-Aryans. He says that the "earliest Brahman settlers were a spirit drinking race and indulged largely in soma beer and strong spirit. To their gods the most acceptable and grateful offering was soma beer, and wine was publicly sold in shops for the use of the community. In the Rig Veda Sanhita a hymn occurs which shows that wine was kept in leather bottles and freely sold to all comers." Gambling was very common then particularly with dice, which one of the hymns (Rig Veda X-34) condemns. The Mahabharata condemns dice gambling which was the real cause of the great war of Kurukshetra and the decimation of the warrior caste, and Manu orders boiling wine to be poured down the throat of the wine seller, who is an outcaste to-day. This was long after

the Vedic age but long before Christ was born. This shows that in these respects Hindus were much more civilized and sober than the followers of Christ, and the palm should be given to Buddhists and Mahomedans who are almost all total abstainers. But what about Christians? Do they not consume more liquor per head than Hindus, Buddhists and Mahomedans? Are they also not very fond of gambling? They never play at cards without a wager, but Hindus never do so. They play cards for mere diversion. So in these matters Christians are less civilized than the followers of the other religions. The United States of America have tried Prohibition, but the law is often evaded and no one dares to propose such a law in Christian Europe. As to gambling, millions of pounds change hands every year in the Derby race, and the University boat race. Indians are learning these vices from the Christians, but I believe they will never lose their national characteristic of sobriety and even now very few go to the races or drink wine.

As to exploiting human labour for one's benefit who are the greatest sinners? The followers of Hinduism, Buddhism and Mahomedanism have rarely been charged with this vice, whereas Christians have been notorious in this respect. I do not wish to say much on this subject, which some may think to be rather beyond the domain of religion, but if the object of religion be to promote the general happiness of mankind, then Christianity falls far short of the ideal of the other religions in these matters, and in estimating the value of Christianity, one has to reckon what harm it has done to humanity by its non-prohibition of wine and of lots, and the exploitation of human labour.

According to the doctrine of Evolution all men and other sentient beings will be better than what they are to-day. They will improve physically and mentally as time progresses. In that case, if the mind does not cease to exist after death, as Spiritualists have tried to prove, it will go on improving for ever. Wallace states his views regarding the future of man after death, but a greater man than he, I mean Buddha has stated his views on this subject in enunciating the doctrine of rebirths, until the man or the sentient being attains Nirvana. This doctrine is known to all learned men. So it is not necessary to say anything about it. But Wallace's view is known to very few. I therefore quote it in full. In pp. 108-9 he says "That after death man's spirit survives in an ethereal body, gifted with new powers, but mentally and morally the same individual as when clothed in flesh. That he commences from that moment a course of apparently endless progression, which is rapid, just in proportion as his mental and moral faculties have been exercised and cultivated while on earth. That his comparative happiness or misery will depend entirely on himself; just in proportion as his higher human faculties have taken part in all his pleasures here, will he find himself contented and happy in a state of existence in which they will have the fullest exercise. While he who has depended more on the body than on the mind for his pleasures, will, when that body is no more, feel a grievous want, and must slowly and painfully develop his intellectual and moral nature till its exercise shall become easy and pleasurable. Neither punishments nor rewards are meted out by an external power, but each one's condition is the natural and inevitable sequence of

his condition here. He starts again from the level of moral and intellectual development to which he has raised himself while on earth.

“ Now here again we have a striking supplement to the doctrines of modern science. The organic world has been carried on to a high state of development, and has been ever kept in harmony with the forces of external nature, by the grand law of “survival of the fittest ” acting upon ever varying organisations. In the spiritual world, the law of the ‘progression of the fittest’ takes its place, and carries on in unbroken continuity that development of the human mind which has been commenced here.”

CHAPTER 14.

INCARNATION.

Before I conclude my observations regarding Christianity, I wish to say something on the broad question of Incarnation. In respect of this matter, I find that no ancient religion except Hinduism and Christianity inculcates belief in the incarnation of the Deity. It might be said that Buddhists believe that Buddha was an incarnation of a previous Buddha. But as to this, Buddha nowhere said that he was an incarnation. In fact he did not believe in God. So he could not be an incarnate God. His followers call him an incarnation. But here the word is used in a different sense. Every man or beast is according to Buddhists, an incarnation of a pre-existing man or beast. That is the meaning of the transmigration of souls. But they do not admit the existence of God, and so the question of incarnation of the Deity cannot be a Buddhistic dogma. As to Hindus they also do not believe in the incarnation of the Deity. They say that God is without any quality (nirgun) and is unchangeable. So he cannot assume any form. They say that the Deity created three gods, Brahma who created the universe, Vishnu who preserves it and Shiva who will destroy everything. This Vishnu and Shiva are not Supreme Deities. They are both married persons and their wives, Lakshmi and Durga are worshipped by all orthodox Hindus. There was no incarnation of Brahma or Shiva, only Vishnu having come down to this earth as occasion required, that occasion being, according to the Geeta, the

preponderance of sin on this earth (Geeta Ch. 4 v. 7.) The Vedas do not mention any incarnation. But the Puranas, which followed the Vedas, mention them, and they do not agree in the number of incarnations. Some Puranas mention ten such incarnations, but the Bhagbat Purana, the Bible of the Vaishnavas (Bk. I. Ch. 3) mentions twenty-two of which the last will come at the end of this present Kali Yuga, which commenced 3101 years before Christ and will last 432,000 years, after which Kalki the last avatar (incarnation) will be born in a Brahmin family and exterminate all the wicked people, and then the golden age will return.

Now it is a matter exceedingly strange that these avatars did nothing for the benefit of mankind as a whole. The first three, Fish, Tortoise and Boar saved the world from falling down in space or sinking and one of them, the Tortoise is still balancing the earth on its back and when it moves there is an earthquake. The fourth the Dwarf, a Brahmin came to deceive and punish king Bali who was proud of his wealth. The Nrisingha avatar half man and half lion came to kill a disbeliever in the godhead of Krishna, but he has not come back though eighty per cent of the human race do not believe in the godhead of Krishna. The sixth Parashurama a Brahmin's son came to destroy the Kshetrias, whom he destroyed twenty-one times, but who, I now find, still exist in large numbers in upper India, and particularly in Rajputana. This avatar killed his own mother under his father's order. But she happened to be a Kshetriya woman, and I believe a Brahmin could in those days put to death with impunity any one who was not a Brahmin, including his own mother. This was the first incarnation in

human form, and he did the above things for the benefit of mankind, which then consisted only of Brahmins, the lower orders of men being considered as allied to quadrupeds. The next avatar was Rama who rescued his wife Seeta after killing Ravana and and the other Rakshashas of Ceylon, Rakshas being a term applied to men who ate raw flesh and drank blood. The next was Balaram, a step brother of Krishna, who bore the earth on his plough and thus prevented its falling down. He did nothing good for humanity. The next, Krishna, was another incarnation. The Bhagbat says that Krishna was the Supreme Being himself (v. 28). The Geeta makes Krishna assert his position as the Supreme Being himself. Ch. 7 vs. 6, 7. Ch. 9 vs. 17. Ch. 10 vs. 3, 8, 12, 32. The next was Buddha, who is ranked among the avatars, but who is said to have come to bewilder the enemies of the gods, a nice way of saying that people have been deceived by him to follow his religion and that they are the enemies of the gods. The Puranas have not a word of praise for Buddha who is rather called a deceiver of mankind. The last, Kalki, is yet to come as previously stated. The Bhagbat Purana says that there are also innumerable incarnations of Hari Ch. 3 vs. 26-27.

The Srimatbhagbat says that Krishna was a complete incarnation, that God in person came down as Krishna, while the rest were only portions of God. It is very difficult to make out what sort of incarnation Jesus was. Was he full God like Krishna or part God, like say, Rama? Probably the Christian will say, Christ was part God, the other two members of the Trinity were also existing at the same time one in Heaven the other elsewhere and not merging in Christ

as was the case with Krishna. But if it be held, that Christ was God himself like Krishna, then a great difficulty will arise. Sir Oliver Lodge in his *Making of Man* p. 178 pertinently asks what will become of the government of this immense universe if God becomes incarnate in Totality. The worst part of the thing is that this God incarnate was put to death as a malefactor by a human being, one of his creations. But the fourth gospel is an authority for saying that Jesus was God incarnate. By God I mean the totality of God, and not any of his so called three parts, said to be of the same substance. Did not John say in Ch. 10 v. 30 that "I and my Father are one?" If that be true, then Christ was the incarnation of the sole God, and how did the government of the universe go on while Christ or Krishna was asleep. Let Christians, and the believers in the supreme godhead of Krishna give an answer to this pertinent question. My reply would be that the gospel of John is apocryphal and that Christ was not God, though he might be god with a small g, as all of us are, or rather ought to be to one another. Christ never called himself God, except in the above verse in John which he retracted in a subsequent verse (36). I fail to see why the Jews, who were dead against idolatry, invented the dogma of incarnation which is a form of idolatry. I say Jews, as all the apostles including Paul and all the first workers were Jews, and it is Jews only who wrote all the books of the New Testament, with the exception of Luke's gospel and Acts, and as to him we do not know for certain to what race he belonged.

The latest book on the subject of incarnations is the *Avatar Tattwa* (enquiry about avatars) by the learned Vedantist Mr. Hirendra Nath Dutta. He says that

the contemporaries of Christ had a very low opinion of him : he is mad 3 Mk. 21. 10 J. 20, he hath a devil, 3 Mk. 36, 7 J. 20, 48, 52, 10 J. 20, he is a friend of publicans and sinners. 9 Mat. 9-11, 2 Mk. 15, 16. 5 L. 27-30. 16 L. 2 a blasphemer. 9 Mat. 3, 26 Mat. 65, 2 Mk. 7, 10 J. 39, "a deceiver, 26 Mat. 6, he deceiveth the people 7 J. 12. (p. 40). In p. 50 he says that the Gnostics believed Jesus and Christ to be two separate beings, the Spirit of God entered the body of Jesus after his baptism and he became Christ. Similarly Nara and Narayana were two ancient Rishis and they came down as Arjuna and Krishna. Krishna was the light of Vishnu at Mathura, the light of Mahavishnu at Dwarka, and the light of Maheswara at Brindaban, Vishnu being the presiding diety of the earth, Mahavishnu, or the great Vishnu that of the solar system, and Maheshwara, or the great God, that of the universe. He cites several texts from Sanscrit books in support of his theory. It is not necessary for me to go into the question of the nature of the divinity of Krishna. As regards Jesus, all I wish to say is that the Gnostic theory is out of date, as there are no Gnostics now on earth.

I have already stated that the Hindus and Christians believe in incarnations. No other civilized nation believed in incarnations. Even the ancient Hindus never thought that it was necessary for the Supreme God to be born of woman and dwell among them. The Hindus excluded the idea of incarnation of the Supreme Deity. They left this work to an inferior diety Vishnu. Jews had no incarnation and their jealous God could never think of becoming a man. Man was made of the image of God, 1 Gen. 26-27 but God never made himself after the image of man.

Mahomed expressly says that he is not God but merely an apostle as other apostles were, 3 Koran v. 138, 7 Koran v. 158, 17 Koran v. 95, "verily I am only a man as ye are." It has remained for Christianity to base itself upon incarnation. Paul based it upon Jesus' resurrection, "If Christ be not risen then your faith is vain." 15 (1 Cor.) 14. Faith in what? In the divinity of Christ. I have shown that the Indian avatars did nothing to save mankind, and most of them did nothing for the benefit of mankind in general, unless it be that some of them saved this earth from total destruction by falling in space or being drowned in the ocean. But this avatar of the Christians has done something for man, as he preached a new religion, and civilized mankind after the Renaissance, though, as I have shown, the Christianity of the Dark Ages lowered man more in the scale of civilization than when he was a subject of pagan Rome.

For my present purpose it is not necessary to say that Adam never fell and hence there was no original sin and therefore no necessity for redemption, nor is it necessary to say that Christ has failed in his mission of redemption of mankind. Ninety nine per cent of mankind was not Christian when Christ died, and even to-day more than three-fourths of mankind are not his followers. Why did not Jesus take better steps to secure the spread of Christianity throughout the world in his lifetime, and why did he not get it followed by all men? During his lifetime he merely said the gospel must first be published among all nations. 13 Mk. 10. Perhaps it will be said that the elect only will be saved. In that case, no incarnation is necessary, as the elect will be saved, whether they follow Christ or not, for once a man is predestined to

be elected and thus to be saved, there remains nothing for him to do. He will wait till the Last Day and whether he be a follower of Christ or not, he will be saved and so the first advent of Jesus is useless.

Then it might be said that Jesus came to give mankind a chance to be saved from hell fire on the Last Day. But what is happening in the meantime? Was man created only for the next world and not for this? Is he to suffer all the miseries of this life, and herein there is no difference between a Christian and a heathen from the first to twentieth centuries, and what has Christ done to ameliorate the condition of mankind on this earth? Is not Might is Right the still prevalent rule of conduct in this world? Have not whole nations and peoples been exterminated by conquerers and by colonists in newly discovered countries, have wars ceased, has exploitation of the weak ceased, does not the child still predecease his parents, in fact I ask all Christians in right earnest whether the miseries, mental and physical, of mankind now living in this world or who lived after the first advent of Christ have been diminished to any extent. No doubt it will be said that modern man has since a century annihilated distance, but is he happier than our ancestors, Christian or heathen? Is not the struggle for existence much keener than it was a century ago? So that we have annihilated distance at the expense of our food. The fact is that the fate of an average living man is almost the same as it was when Christ was born. So that the physical condition of man has not improved by any teaching of this incarnate Christ. As to the mental condition of man, nine-tenths of mankind are still illiterate, and there was very little intellectual improvement since Christ

came until the end of the Dark Ages. Does not this struggle for existence which prevails now tell heavily upon the mental condition of mankind in general, notwithstanding the immense fortunes of some rich men, fortunes unheard of in former times? Remove our keen struggle for existence, which prevents nearly half the human race from ever having two full meals a day, and no one except the rich, will object to part with the comforts brought to our homes by science. O Christ, if you are really God and as omnipotent as God is believed to be by all people, why did you not first remove the miseries suffered by man and beast in this world, instead of holding out a hope of future bliss, which may prove false at last? When you came somehow or other the world and all its inhabitants, men, beasts, fishes, birds or worms had drifted into a state of insupportable misery preying upon one another and had you not eyes to see all this and had you not power either to alleviate or abolish all this misery? You must have seen all this misery around you and you did nothing for the removal of this. Either you had power to remove it or you had not that power. In the latter case you are no better than any of us, and you have no right to claim godhead. If you had power and still kept quiet and never thought of ameliorating all this misery, why should we call you God as you never used your power for our good? I cannot believe that you did not contemplate all this misery as you were very kind hearted. Then why did you leave this misery alone without any attempt to banish or lessen it? Instead of that you held out a hope of eternal bliss to your followers and of eternal hell fire to all non-believers, including, even at this day, nearly three fourths of the

human race. Of course you were according to your ideas, partly justified, as you believed that the end was very near, so near that your generation would see your second advent, when all worldly miseries would cease. But whatever may be in store for us after the Last Day, you never came as promised and the Last Day has been indefinitely postponed and we, all sentient beings, are wallowing in the fire of this world and we are giving birth to creatures like ourselves who will suffer what we have suffered, and so this vicious circle will go on, if not for eternity, a word which no finite being can understand at least for millions of years, and as far as human eye can see, there is no escape from this misery of all sentient beings. O Jesus remove all this misery and I for one will acknowledge your godhead, but not till then.

And now, Christ, before bidding you farewell, I beg leave of you to tender my most respectful homage to you. You were a truly great man, and with the exception of Buddha, there is no other man on earth who can hold the candle before you. Your greatest misfortune was that you were born a Jew and brought up in the ancient laws and traditions of the Jews, whereas Buddha, a prince of the royal Kshetriya blood, cut through the principal laws, religious and social, of his country and promulgated an entirely new religion based upon universal love. He was the first man to declare that the religion of the Vedas was wrong, but you stuck to the Mosaic law, he was the first to abolish all distinctions of caste on which the whole Brahmanic religion hinged, but you made a great distinction between Jew and Gentile. Herein lay the superiority of Buddha. In all other respects there is very little difference between you two. Both

of you have based his religion on love, with this difference that Buddha spoke of love of man and other sentient beings. Herein Buddha's religion is superior to yours, for Buddha thought that God may or may not exist, but man and sentient beings do exist, whereas you cared only for God and man. So Buddha's religion is more universal and practical than yours, for God may or may not exist but we all certainly exist, and a hereafter may or may not exist, but the present certainly exists, and you cared only for the future life whereas Buddha thought of the present and also the future life and brought out the all embracing theory of Karma (work) to explain everything. Both of you were equally great but you both have suffered from the zeal of your followers, who instead of making you the greatest of mortals have made you incarnations, one an incarnation of a previous Buddha, who was a man and not a god, and you, Christ, an incarnation of the supreme God, the result being that you have been lowered in the estimation of non-Christians, as they judge you not by what you said or did but by the standard of a perfect God, in which respect all incarnations, including yours, miserably fail.

And now, gentle reader, farewell. If by the use of any improper expression I have given offence to anybody or unnecessarily or unjustifiably found fault with the religion of Christ or any other religion I beg your pardon. Christ or any of his followers is not my enemy. I shall be sorry to know that I have any enemy on earth as all men and women are my brothers and sisters. I owe my education to people who happened to be Christians and I do not wish to be ungrateful to them. I never intended to hurt any one's feelings. My only object throughout has been

to seek truth and to expose fallacies. The reader is to judge how far I have succeeded. Amen.

FINIS.

APPENDIX I.

OLD TESTAMENT

SYNOPSIS ON THE PENTATEUCH.

Covenant of God.

- 15 Gen. 18 With Abram and his seed between Nile and Euphrates.
- 17 Gen 8-12 with Abram and his seed granting Canaan etc., for ever if Jews circumsise.
- 19 Ex 5-6 God said if Jews keep his covenant they will be his favourite people.
- 30 Deut. 16 If you keep commandments then you will live and multiply.

Decalogue or Commandments.

- 20 Ex. 1-17 Ten commandments.
- 19 Lev. 11-19 Repetition of sundry laws.
- 5 Deut. 7-21 Two commandments.

Love of retaliation.

- 21 Ex. 24 Eye for eye etc.
- 24 Lev. 20 do
- 19 Deut. 21 do
- 35 Num. 19 Murder.

Observe the Sabbath.

- 31 Ex. 13 God's order.
- 35 Ex. 2 Moses' Lo.
- 19 Lev. 30 } God's order.
- 26 Lev. 2 }
- 5 Deut. 12 }

Passover to be observed.

- 12 Ex. 3-28 Instituted by God.
- 23 Lev. 5
- 9 Num. 2

APPENDIX II.

NEW TESTAMENT.

SYNOPSIS.

1. Angels sent to hell.
2 (2 Pet.) 4, 1 Jude 6, 12 Rev. 9 to earth.
2. Baptism.
3 J. 5, 4 J. 2 by disciples. 3 J. 5, 4 J. 1-2.
28 Mt. 19, 19 A. 3-5 John's and Jesus'.
3. Blood purifies everything.
9 Heb. 22.
4. Book of Life.
3 Rev. 5, 20 Rev. 12, 15, 21 Rev. 27.
5. Brethren and sisters.
6 Mk. 3, 13 Mt. 55-6, 2 J. 12, 7 J. 5.
6. Brethren's faith.
7 J. 5, 6 Mk. 3, 13 Mt. 56-7.
7. Charity.
3 Col. 14, 1 (1 Tim.) 5, 13 (1 Cor.) 13.
8. Commandments.
19 Mt. 17-19.
9. Cross, who bore.
27 Mt. 32 Simon.
15 Mk. 21 Simon.
23 L. 26 Simon.
19 J. 17 Jesus.
10. Crucifixion.
37 Matt. 31 etc. 15 Mk. 20 etc. 23 L. 25 etc. 18
J. 16 etc.
11. Curse on cities.
11 Mt. 20-23.
6 Mk. 11.
10 L. 12-16.

- 11.—(*Contd.*)
10 Mt. 16.
12. Dreams.
1 Mt. 20, 2 Mt. 12, 2 Mt. 13, 2 Mt. 29, 2 Mt. 22, 27 Mt. 19.
13. Elect to be gathered.
8 Rom. 33, 24 Mt. 31, 13 Mk. 27, 2 (2 Tim.) 10, 1 (1 Pet.) 2.
14. End near.
4 (1 Pet.) 7, 3 (2 Pet.) 10, 17 Matt. 28. 5 (1 Thess.) 5 caught up in the clouds and ever with Jesus.
15. Faith.
10 Heb. 38, 11 do. 1 (def.) 5 James 15 prayer, 1 Rom. 17, 2 Rom. 20, 3 Rom. 41, 4 Rom. 4-5, 9 Rom. 31-32, 11 Rom. 5-6, 14 Rom. 23, 2 Gal. 16, 3 Gal. 11, 2 Rom. 28, 21 Mt. 21, mountain, 3 Rom. 28, 5 Gal. 6, 2 Gal. 21, 5 James 14-15, prayer of faith cure sickness. 17 L. 6.
16. Faith removes mountain and gives things.
21 Mt. 21, 17 Mt. 20-21 prayer and fasting, 11 Mk. 23-24, 1 Cor. 13. 2, 17 L. 6 (sycamore tree). 12 Mk. 23.
17. Faith without works.
2 James 14, 17, 20, 24, 26. 20 Rev. 12, 13, 22 Rev. 12, 6 Gal. 7, 2 Rom. 13 (contra 3 Rom. 20, 2 Rom. 28), 3 Tit. 5 (grace) 11 Rom. 6, 16 Mt. 27, 5 J. 29.
18. Father in Heaven.
5 Mt. 16, 34, 45, 48, 6 Mt. 1, 9, 32, 7 Mt. 21, 10 Mt. 32, 33, 16 Mt. 17, 18 Mt. 10, 14, 35. 11 Mk. 25, 26, 23 Mt. 22, God's throne in heaven. 11 L. 2.

19. Fire in hell (everlasting).
9 Mk. 43, 44, 1 Jude 6, 25 Mt. 41, 46, 13 Mt.
42, 50, 3 Mk. 29, 16 Mk. 16, 5 J. 29, 3 J. 16,
36.
20. Gift on recovery in Mosaic law.
8 Mt. 4, 1 Mk. 44, 5 L. 14.
21. God hardeneth.
9 Rom. 18.
2 (2 Thess.) 9-12. He deludes to damned.
22. God is love.
4 (1 John.) 8.
23. God, love of.
22 Mt. 37, 12 Mk. 30, 10 L. 27.
24. God's face, seen by Angels.
18 Mt. 10.
1 L. 19 Gabriel.
25. God of our fathers.
22 A. 14, 24 A. 14, Paul's saying.
26. God's son.
22 L. 70.
9 J. 35-38.
10 J. 36.
17 J. 1.
26 Mt. 64.
27. Gospel, preaching of, to the world.
24 Mt. 14.
28 Mt. 19, 20.
16 Mk. 15.
24 L. 47.
13 Mk. 10.
28. Grace.
2 Tit. 11, 3 Tit. 5, 7, 2 Ep. 5.
29. Heavens destroyed on Last Day.
3 (2 Pet.) 10, 12.

30. Heaven is God's throne.
23 Matt. 22, 5 Matt. 34.
31. Heaven, looking up to.
14 Mt. 19, 6 Mk. 41, 9 L. 16.
32. Heaven, names written in.
10 L. 20.
33. His people.
1 Mt. 21, 2 Mt. 6, 15 Mt. 24-6, 7 Mk. 27, 1 L.
68 sins 77 (sins).
34. Holy Ghost.
3 Mt. 16 Spirit of God descended.
12 Mt. 31-31 Blasphemy against.
3 Mk. 29 " "
2 A. 38 Baptism in Christ's name for it.
10 A. 44 Holy Ghost fell upon hearers when
Peter spoke.
13 A. 2 It said separate me Saul and Barnabas.
8 A. 17 Holy Ghost fell on baptised in Jesus'
name.
19 A. 5-6 Holy Ghost fell on newly baptised.
Hands laid.
16 J. 7 I shall send comforter after I go.
8 J. 39 Holy Ghost not given as Christ not yet
glorified.
14 J. 26 Comforter whom God will send in my
name.
15 J. 26 Comforter whom God will send in my
name.
Do Spirit of Truth.
35. Holy Supper.
26 Mt. 26-28, 14 Mk. 22-24, 22 L. 19-20.
36. Iscariot.
26 Mt. 23 dippeth his hand.
14 Mk. 20 " " "

36.—(*Contd.*)

- 13 J. 26 I have dipped my hand.
37. Jesus abuses contemporaries.
12 Matt. 34 Vipers.
23 Mt. 33 Vipers.
38. Jesus, agony.
26 Mt. 39-42.
39. Jesus coming in the clouds.
25 Mt. 31, 8 Mt. 38, 13 Mt. 26, 9 L. 26-27, 21 L. 27.
40. Jesus, commandments of.
19 Mt. 17-19, 23 Mt. 37-40, 10 Mk. 19, 12 Mk. 29-31, 18 L. 19-20.
41. Jesus created the world.
1 Col. 15-17, 1 Heb. 2.
42. Jesus is Christ.
16 Mt. 16-17 (Peter) admits he is Christ.
23 Mt. 8, 10 I am Christ.
26 Mt. 63-64 I am Christ.
14 Mk. 61-62. 24 L. 21, 4 J. 26.
43. Jesus king of Jews.
24 L. 21 Israel. 2 Mt. 2, 27 Mt. 11, 37, 15 Mk. 2, 26, 23 L. 3, 38. 18 J. 37, 19 J. 19, 1 J. 49 Israel, 12 J. 13 (Israel), 18 J. 36 not of this world, 18 J. 37 thou sayest it, I come for truth.
44. Jesus, salvation only through.
16 Mk. 16, 8 J. 24, 14 J. 6, 3 J. 16, 2(2 Thess) 12.
45. Jesus saw Satan fall from heaven.
10 L. 18.
46. Jesus, Self-description.
5 Mt. 17-19 I came to fulfil not to destroy law and prophets. Till all be fulfilled, no tittle of law can pass.

46. (*Contd.*)

10 Mk. 18 Why callest me good, there is none good but one, that is God.

24 Matt. 29-35 When the world will be destroyed Jesus will come to judge mankind.

13 Mk. 24-31 Fig tree parable interpolated.

21 L. 25-33.

9 Mt. 13 Elias is come.

11 Mt. 27 All things delivered to Jesus and he only knows God.

17 Mt. 12 Elias.

18 Mt. 11 Come to save.

5 J. 19 What God does Jesus does.

„ 22 All judgments committed to Son.

„ 23 Honour Father and Son.

„ 27 Jesus has authority to execute judgments.

6 J. 47 Believer on me hath everlasting life.

„ 48, 51 I am the bread of life.

„ 54 Eaters of my flesh and blood have eternal life.

7 J. 38 Believers' bellies are rivers of living water.

8 J. 12 I am the light of the world—9 J. 5.

„ 23 I am from above, ye are from beneath.

„ 24 If you don't believe I am he you die in your sins.

„ 38 I speak what I have seen with my Father.

„ 54 My Father honoureth me.

„ 58 Before Abraham was I am.

9 J. 5 I am the light of the world—8 J. 12.

„ 35-38 Jesus is God's son.

46.—(*Contd.*)

- 10 J. 8 Those who came before me are thieves and robbers.
- „ 9 I am the door.
- „ 11 I am the good shepherd.
- „ 15 God and I know one another.
- „ 30 I and my Father are one.
- 36 I am the Son of God.
- 11 J. 4 Son of God.
- „ 25 I am the resurrection and the life.
- 12 J. 44-45 Believer and seer of me believe and see God.
- „ 46 I am the light of the world—8 J. 12—9 J. 5.
- „ 47 I come to save not to judge.
- „ 49 I speak as God commanded me.
- 13 J. 5 Washing feet of disciples.
- „ 34 Love one another as I have loved you.
- 14 J. 6 I am the true way, the truth and the life, no man cometh unto the Father but by me.
- „ 11 I am in the Father.
- „ 12 Who believes in me will do what I do.
- „ 13-14 Ask anything in my name, I will do it.
- „ 24 My words are my Father's.
- „ 28 My Father is greater than I.
- „ 15 J. I I am the true vine.
- „ 7 Ask what ye will and it shall be done.
- 16 J. 15 "All things that the Father hath are mine".
- „ 23 "What you ask in my name he will give."
- 17 J. 2 "Power over all flesh has been given me."

46. (*Contd.*)

„ 4 „ I have finished the work you gave me.”

„ 5 „ Glory I had with thee before the world was.”

„ 9 “ I pray not for the world but for them thou hast given me, for they are thine”.

„ 20 “I pray also for believers”.

„ 21 “Father is in me and I in him”.

„ 24 “Thou lovedest me before the foundation of the world”.

9 Mt. 6 Jesus has power to forgive sins.

11 Mt. 27 “All things are delivered to me and I only know God and those to whom I shall reveal”.

12 Mt. 6 “I am greater than the temple”.

„ 8 Lord of the Sabbath.

„ 41-42 -do- Jonas and Salamon.

18 Mt. 11 “I am come to save”.

26 Mt. 53 “On asking God will send more than 12 legions of angels”.

2 Mk. 28 Lord of the Sabbath.

9 Mk. 13 I am Elias.

24 Mt. 29-35

13 Mk. 24-31 } Jesus will come in the clouds
21 L. 25-33 } to judge mankind.

22 L. 70 I am the Son of God.

17 J. 25 Father, the world hath not known Thee, but I have known Thee, and these have known that thou hast sent me.

47. Jesus' side pierced.

19 J. 34.

48. Jesus sitting on God's right hand.

16 Mk. 19, 2 L. 69, 7 A. 55.

49. Jesus to judge on Last Day.
24 Mt. 29-35, 13 Mt. 24-3-1, 21 L. 25-33, 25 Mt. 31-46, 13 Mt. 31-46, 13 Mt. 41,42,43, 16 Mt. 27-28, 8 Mt. 38, 13 Mt. 26, 9 L. 26-27.
50. Jesus, touching feet of.
28 Mt. 9 touched. 6 L. 19, 8 L. 44, 46, 20 L. 17, 26, 6 L. 19 touching and virtue going out, 20 J. 17 Touch me not, 27 Thomas touched side.
51. Jesus, trial of.
26 Matt. 57-66, 27 Matt. 31, 14 Mk. 53 to 15 Mk. 20, 22 L. 54 to 23 L. 25, 18 J. 12 to 19 J. 16.
52. Jews, Jesus came for only.
10 Mt. 5-6, 15 Mt. 24,26, Syro Phenician, 7 Mk. 27, 1 L. 33, 68-77 Zacharia (enemies), 24 L. 21 redeemed Israel, 1 J. 49, 2 Rom. 10 Jesus first, 1 Rom. 16 first Jew, 19 Mt. 28 judging 12 tribes, 74, 24 L. 21 Israel redeemed, 4 J. 22 "Salvation is of the Jews". 1 A. 6 Israel, 1 Mt. 21 his people saved.
53. Jews, tribulation of.
24 Mt. 1-31, 13 Mk. 7-23, 21 L. 5-25.
54. Judging men.
25 Matt. 34, 41. Jesus to judge.
12 J. 47 "I came not to judge the world but to save the world". 20 Rev. 12-13 God judges after resurrection according to works.
55. Judging 12 tribes.
19 Matt. 28, 2 L. 30.
56. Keys of Death.
1 Rev. 18 with Christ.
57. Keys of Heaven.
16 Mt. 15-19 with Peter (23 Peter is Satan)

58. Keys of Hell.

1 Rev. 18 with Christ.

20 Rev. 1 with angel.

59. Kingdom of heaven.

8 Mt. 11 at hand, 5 Mt. 3, 10, 7 Mt. 21, 10 Mt.

7 at hand, 16 Mt. 19 Keys, 3 Mt. 2 at hand,

4 Mt. 17, at hand, 13 Mt. 11, 24, 33, 2 Thess.

2. 2. 8 L. 10, 12 L. 31, 14 J. 2 many man-

sions in Father's house. 22 L. 30.

60. Kingdom of Jesus.

22 L. 29-30 eating, drinking and judging, 18 J.

36, 19 Mt. 28 throne, 22 L. 69 sit on right

hand of power.

61. Kingdoms of the world shown to Jesus.

4 Mt. 8, 2 Mk. 27-28.

62. Last Supper.

26 Matt. 26-29, 14 Mk. 22-25, 22 L. 19 etc.

63. Law to prevail.

5 Mt. 17 come to fulfil.

16 L. 17 no tittle of law can fail.

2 Gal. 21 righteous cometh not by law, else
Jesus is dead in vain.24 A. 14 Paul said I believe in the law and the
prophets.8 Mt. 4 offering by cured leper. 1 Mk. 44,
5 L. 14.

64. Laying of hands.

4 (1 Tim.) 14, 1 (2 Tim.) 6, 4 L. 40 (blessing),

19 Mt. 15(blessing), 6 A. 6. 8 A. 17, 19 A. 6,

(10 Mk. 16 for blessnig).

65. Legion.

8 Mt. 28-34, 5 Mk. 1-17, 8 L. 26-40.

66. Life (everlasting).

17 J. 3, 19 Mt. 29, 4 J. 36, 10 J. 29, 2 Tim. 2. 10,

66.—(*Contd.*)

- 1 Jo. 5. 11, 5(1 Jo.)11, 3 J. 16, 36, 5 J. 24.29, 6 J. 35, 40, 47, 51, 54. 11 J. 25.
67. Love thy neighbour as thyself.
13 Rom. 8-10, 5 Gal. 14, 22 Mt. 39, 12 Mk. 31, 10 L. 27, 2 James 8, 3 (1 John) 11, 14-17 brethren 23.
1 (2 John) 10 receive not: non-Christians, 4 (1 John) 7, 20, 13 J. 34, one another, 15 J. 12. 17, love one another as I have loved you. 19 Matt. 19.
68. Mary angels' visit to.
1 L. 11 Zacharia, 1 L. 28 Mary, 2 L. 10 shepherds, 22 L. 43 to Jesus.
69. Mother and brethren after Jesus' death.
1 A. 14.
71. Mother and brethren in the crowd.
12 Mt. 46-50, 8 L. 19-21, 3 Mk. 31-5.
70. Mother at the cross.
19 J. 25.
72. Miracles boast about.
11 Mt. 5, 16 Mt. 9. 10, 7 L. 22.
73. Miscellaneous.
4 Mt. 8 High mountain, Jesus taken to top.
4 Mt. 1-2. Forty days in wilderness.
3 Mt. 16 Spirit of God like a dove.
4 Mt. 24 People cured.
7 Mt. 12 Do unto others etc.
4 Mt. 24 Gift Moses commanded. (Prayer)
10 Mt. 5-7 Sending 12—7 L. 22.
11 Mt. 20-23 Upbrading cities Capernaum.
16 Mt. 23 Peter is Satan, get behind me.
19 Mt. 28 You 12 will judge 12 tribes, sitting on thrones.

73.—(*Contd.*)

26 Mt. 32 Going to Galilee.

27 Mt. 66 Watch at tomb.

28 Mt. 6 Angel said to two Marys that he is risen.

„ 7 Goeth to Galilee angel said.

„ 16-18 Meeting in a mountain and power given.

9 Mk. 29 Prayer and fasting remove devils.

13 Mk. 10 Gospel to be published among all nations.

14 Mk. 20 Iscariot dippeth—26 Mt. 23 contra 13 J. 26.

16 Mk. 5-7 Young men said he is risen, go to Galilee.

„ 12 Appeared before 1.

„ 14 Appeared before 11.

„ 15 Preach to the world.

„ 16 Believers' and unbelievers' fate, and power.

„ 19 Ascension.

1 L. 19 I am Gabriel who stand in God's presence.

„ 26-37 Angels' announcement.

„ 37 Reign over Jacob's house for ever.

„ 67-79 Zacharia's prophecy.

2 L. 10-12 Angels and shepherds.

„ 44 Jesus left behind.

6 L. 12-16 Went to a mountain and chose 12.

„ 17 Came down on the plain.

„ 20-49 Sermon.

10 L. 1 70 sent in batches of 2.

22 L. 30 Eat and drink in my kingdom at my table and judge 12 tribes of Israel.

73.—(*Contd.*)

- „ 76 Son of God.
 23 L. 34 Father forgive them.
 24 L. 4 Women saw 2 men at the grave.
 1 J. 42 Peter when seen was calld Ciaphas.
 „ 51 Angels ascending upon Son of man
 after heaven opened.
 4 J. 24 God is a spirit.
 9 J. 1-3 Blind and his parents have not sinned
 but God's works must be made manifest
 in him.
 18 J. 20-21 Jesus refuses to answer Caiaphas.
 19 J. 17 Jesus bore his cross.
 „ 25 Mother present.
 20 J. 12 2 Angels at tomb.
 1 Acts. 3 Jesus seen 40 days.
 „ 9 Ascension.
 2 Acts. 20 Sun and Moon dark and bloody.
 „ 58 Baptism in Jesus' name for Holy Ghost.
 7 Acts. 33 Shoes and holy ground.
 8 „ 39 Philip vanished.
 10 „ 44 Holy Ghost fell when Peter who
 spoke.
 13 „ 2 Holy Ghost said separate me, Saul
 and Barnabas.
 17 „ 26 All nations made of one blood.
 19 „ 5-6 Fresh baptism in Jesus' name, Paul
 lays his hands and Holy Ghost came.
 28 „ 28 Salvation for Gentiles also.
 1 Rom. 26-31 Vile affections.
 12 Rom. }
 13 „ } Sermon.
 14 „ }
 15 „ } 11 (1 Cor.) 23-27 Eucharist.

73.—(*Contd.*)

2 Ph. 6 Jesus being in God's form thought it not necessary to be his equal, but made himself a servant and became man.

4 (1 Thess.) 16-17 When Jesus will come we which are alive will be caught up and will pass in the air and be with Jesus for ever.

9 Heb. 7 High priest alone entered the second tabernacle once a year with blood offered for himself and the errors of the people.

10 Heb. 31 It is fearful to fall into the hands of the living God.

2 (1 Pet.) 13-14 Submit to laws and governors.

" " 17 Honour the king.

74. Paradise.

23 L. 43 this day vide 20 J. 17, 22 L. 30 eating and trying 12 tribes.

75. Paul believed in law and prophets.

24 A. 14, 2 Gal. 21.

76. Paul got gospel from Christ.

1 Gal. 12.

77. Peter's denial.

26 Mt. 74-75, 14 Mk. 71-72, 22 L. 60-61, 10 J. 26-27.

78. Predestination.

1 (1 Pet.) 1, 8 Rom. 29, 2 Ep. 10.

79. Present generation.

4 (1 Thess.) 17, 24 Mt. 34-35, 4 (1 Thess.) 15-16, 23 Mt. 36, 9 Mk. 1, 13 Mk. 30-31, 9 L. 27, 21 L. 32-33, 16 Mt. 28, 5 J. 25-28 hour is coming and now is, 5 James 8 nigh, 4 (1 Thess.) 16-17, 4 (1 Pet.) 7, at hand.

80. Purging the temple.

21 Mt. 12, 11 Mk. 15, 19 L. 45, 2 J. 14.

81. Ransom for many.

20 Mt. 28, 10 Mk. 45, 5 Rom. 19.

82. Resurrection and afterwards.

28 Mt. 6-7 Angel tells them he was going to Galilee.

„ 9 First meeting with 11.

„ 16-18 Meeting with 11 on a mountain and power given.

„ 19-20 Preach to all, baptise in 3 names, I am with you.

16 Mk. 5-7 Young man said he is risen, go to Galilee.

„ 9 Appeared first to Magdalene.

„ 12 Appeared before 2.

„ 14 „ „ 11.

„ 15 Preach to the world.

„ 16 Damnation.

„ 17-18 Power.

„ 19 Ascension.

24 L. 6 2 Men said he is risen.

„ 15 First appearance before 2 travellers.

„ 34 Before Peter.

„ 36 Before 11.

„ 39 Hands and feet shown.

„ 42 Ate fish.

„ 47 Preach repentance and revision of sins.

„ 51 Ascension.

„ 20 John 12 2 Angels.

„ 14 etc. Meeting with Mary.

„ 19 First meeting, doors shut.

„ 26 Second „ „ „

21 J. 14 Third.

„ 15 Feed my lambs.

„ 16 Feed my sheep.

82.—(*Contd.*)

” 17 Feed my sheep.

” 24 I am the disciple who saw.

15 (1 Cor.) 3-8. Paul's version, 500 men
saw.

1 A. 3 Christ seen 40 days.

83. Resurrection and judgment.

24 Mt. 29-31, 13 Mk. 24-27, 21 L. 25-28, 3
(2 Pet.) 10.

84. Resurrection is basis of faith.

15 (1 Cor.) 14.

85. Resurrection, what is.

15 (1 Cor.) 44, spiritual body.

9 A. 37, 40 Tabitha's resurrection by Peter.

86. Rich and poor.

19 Mt. 16-30, 10 Mk. 17-31, 18 L. 18-30 (14
L. 25. 19 L. 26) 6 L. 20, 16 L. 19-31.

87. Sabbath, Lord of.

12 Mt. 8, 2 Mk. 27-28.

88. Science.

6 (1 Tim.) 20.

89. Second advent.

3 (2 Pet.) 10, 25 Mt. 31-46 (trial), 26 Mt. 64
14 Mk. 62, 8 Mk. 38, 13 Mk. 24-27, 21 L.
27, 24 Mt. 29-31, 37, 39, 44.

5 J. 28, 29 (resurrection), 10 Matt. 23, 24 Mt. 14,
4 (1 Pet.) 7, 19 Matt. 28, 25 Mt. 13, 31,
22 L. 69.

90. Sending 70 disciples.

10 L. 1.

91. Sermons.

Mt. Chs. 5-7 on the mount.

6 L. 20-49 ” ” plain.

91.—(*Contd.*)

- 11 L. 2-4 Lord's prayer.
 6 Mt. 9-13 " "
 12 to 15 Rom.
92. Signs, boast of.
 11 Mt. 5, 7 L. 22.
93. Signs required.
 1 (1 Cor.) 22, 2 J. 18.
94. Signs, refused by Jesus.
 12 Mt. 39-40, 16 Mt. 4, 8 Mk. 11, 12, 11 L. 29-30.
95. Sin (Adam's) and death.
 5 Rom. 12, 17.
96. Son of carpenter.
 6 Mk. 3, 13 Mt. 55.
97. Son of David.
 9 Mt. 27, 1 L. 32, 69. 18 L. 38. 12 Mt. 23.
 15 Mt. 22. 20 Mt. 30.
 21 Mt. 9, 15. 22 Mt. 42. 2 Acts. 30. 2 Tim.
 2. 8. 12 Mk. 35. 1 Mk. 16. 20 L. 41.
 2 Tim. 2. 8. 22 Rev. 16.
98. Son of Joseph.
 2 L. 48, 1 J. 45, 3 L. 23, 4 L. 22.
99. Swine and legion.
 8 Mt. 28-34, 5 Mk. 1-17, 8 L. 26-40.
100. Temple cracked etc.
 27 Mt. 51-2, 23 L. 44-45.
101. Thieves on the cross.
 27 Mt. 44 abuse Jesus.
 23 L. 40 one in favour.
 " 43 He will be in paradise with me (Jesus)
 to-day. 15 Mk. 23 Abused Jesus.
102. Third day rising.
 12 Mt. 40. 16 Mt. 21. 20 Mt. 19. 8 Mk. 31 after
 three days.

102.—(*Contd.*)

10 Mk. 34, 9 L. 23. 18 L. 33. 17 Mt. 23. 9 Mk.
31. 24 L. 7.

103. Thought of food or life.

12L. 22. 28-31. 6 Mt. 25, 31, 34.

104. Trinity.

5 (I John.) 7.

105. Unbelievers.

18 Mt. 17 heathen, 14 J. 6 only through Christ.
1 (2 John.) 10 receive not. 1 (1 Cor.) 21.

106. Vision.

9 A. 3. 10. 10 A. 11 (heaven opened). 11 A. 5.
16 A. 9. 22 A. 6. 18. 26 A. 13. 27 A. 23. 7
A. 55.

107. Voice from heaven.

3 Mt. 16, 17. 17 Mt. 5. 1 Mk. 10-11, 9 Mk. 7. 3
L. 21, 22.

9 L. 35. 12 J. 28. 26 A. 14. 1 (2 Pet.) 17.

108. Washing feet.

13 J. 1-10.

109. Works.

(Vide No. 17 Faith without works).

110. Worldliness.

2 (1 John.) 15. 12 J. 25.

APPENDIX III.

This Appendix is intended to show that the synoptic gospels were copied from one original with additions and omissions. The Division into chapters and verses was the work of the translators and was not methodically done. It is not to be found in the original Greek text. The order of the chapters, the collocation of the verses and their identical wording prove that the evangelists copied from an original text or from one another. I have given the result of the comparison of the several chapters of Matthew and Mark, but not of Luke lest I should tire the reader's patience. Chapters three and four of Matthew up to verse 24 correspond to 1 Mark 2 to 28, then Matthew gives the Sermon on the Mount in chapters five to seven, then 8 Matthew 14-16 again correspond to 1 Mark 30-32 which shows that the Sermon on the Mount the best thing in the Bible, is an interpolation.

3	Mat.	vs.	3-17=1	Mk.	vs.	2, 3, 5, 11.
4	"	"	1- 2	"	"	12-13.
"	"	"	11-23	"	"	14-21.
"	"	"	24	"	"	28.
8	"	"	2- 4	"	"	40-44.
"	"	"	14-16	"	"	30-32.
"	"	"	24	4 Mk.	"	37.
"	"	"	25-27	"	"	38-41.
"	"	"	29	5 Mk.	"	7.
"	"	"	30-33	"	"	12-14.
"	"	"	34	"	"	17.
9	"	"	2-17	2 Mk.	"	3, 5-12, 14-22.
10	"	"	1- 4	3 Mk.	"	14-19.
12	"	"	1- 4	2 Mk.	"	23-26.
"	"	"	5	"	"	22.

12	Mat.	vs.	8=2	Mk.	vs.	28.
"	"	"	10	3 Mk.	"	1.
"	"	"	13-15	"	"	5-17.
"	"	"	16	"	"	12.
"	"	"	31	"	"	29.
13	"	"	1-11	4 Mk.	"	1-11.
"	"	"	13	"	"	12.
"	"	"	19-23	"	"	15-20.
"	"	"	31-32	"	"	30-32.
"	"	"	53-58	6 Mk.	"	1-5.
14	"	"	15	"	"	35, 56.
"	"	"	17	"	"	38.
"	"	"	19	"	"	39, 41.
"	"	"	20-27	"	"	43-50.
15	"	"	1- 2	7 Mk.	"	5.
"	"	"	3- 6	"	"	9-11, 13.
"	"	"	10-11	"	"	14-15.
"	"	"	15-17	"	"	17-19.
"	"	"	22	"	"	25-26.
"	"	"	24	"	"	27.
"	"	"	26-28	"	"	27-29.
"	"	"	29	"	"	31.
"	"	"	32-29	8 Mk.	"	2-10.
16	"	"	1	"	"	11.
"	"	"	4- 8	"	"	12-17.
"	"	"	9-11	"	"	19-21.
"	"	"	13-16	"	"	27-29.
"	"	"	20-27	"	"	30-38.
"	"	"	28	9 Mk.	"	1.
17	"	"	1- 9	"	"	2-9.
"	"	"	10-12	"	"	11-13.
"	"	"	15-17	"	"	17-19.
"	"	"	19	"	"	28.
"	"	"	21-23	"	"	29-31.

18	Mat.	vs.	1=9	Mk.	vs.	34.
"	"	"	2	"	"	36.
"	"	"	5	"	"	37.
"	"	"	6	"	"	42.
"	"	"	8	"	"	43, 45.
"	"	"	9	"	"	47.
19	"	"	1-3	10 Mk.	"	1-2.
"	"	"	4-5	"	"	6-7.
"	"	"	6	"	"	9.
"	"	"	7-8	"	"	4-5.
"	"	"	9	"	"	11-12.
"	"	"	13-14	"	"	13-14.
"	"	"	15	"	"	16.
"	"	"	16-23	"	"	17-23.
"	"	"	24-27	"	"	25-28.
"	"	"	28-30	"	"	30-31.
20	"	"	17-31	"	"	32-49.
"	"	"	33-34	"	"	51-52.
21	"	"	1-3	11 Mk.	"	1-3.
"	"	"	6-9	"	"	6-10.
"	"	"	12	"	"	15.
"	"	"	13	"	"	17.
"	"	"	15	"	"	18.
"	"	"	17-19	"	"	11-14.
"	"	"	21-22	"	"	23-24.
"	"	"	24-27	"	"	29-33.
"	"	"	33-36	12 Mk.	"	1-4.
"	"	"	37	"	"	6-11.
"	"	"	45-46	"	"	12.
22	"	"	15-32	"	"	13-27.
"	"	"	34-39	"	"	28-31.
"	"	"	42-45	"	"	35-37.
23	"	"	6	"	"	39.
"	"	"	7	"	"	38.

23	Mat.	vs.	14=12	Mk.	vs.	40.
24	"	"	1-9	13	"	1-9.
"	"	"	13	"	"	13.
"	"	"	14	"	"	10.
"	"	"	15-25	"	"	14-23.
"	"	"	29-36	"	"	24-32.
"	"	"	42	"	"	35.
26	"	"	3-18	14	Mk.	" 1-14.
"	"	"	19-24	"	"	16-21.
"	"	"	26-43	"	"	22-40.
"	"	"	45-51	"	"	41-47.
"	"	"	55-56	"	"	48-50.
"	"	"	57-61	"	"	53-58.
"	"	"	62-68	"	"	60-65.
"	"	"	69-75	"	"	67-72.
27	"	"	2	15	Mk.	" 1.
"	"	"	11-16	"	"	2-7.
"	"	"	17-23	"	"	9-14.
"	"	"	26-35	"	"	15-24.
"	"	"	37-38	"	"	26-27.
"	"	"	39-40	"	"	29.
"	"	"	41-42	"	"	31-32.
"	"	"	44-51	"	"	33-38.
"	"	"	54	"	"	39.
"	"	"	55	"	"	41-43.
"	"	"	58-61	"	"	45-47.
28	"	"	1	16	Mk.	" 1-2.
"	"	"	5-9	"	"	6-9.

Mat.		Mark.		Luke.
1	=		=	1-3.
2	"		"	2.
3	"	1	"	3.
4	"	1	"	4, 5.
5	"		"	6.
8	"	1, 4, 5.	"	4, 5, 7, 9.
9	"	2	"	5, 9.
10	"	3	"	6, 9.
11	"		"	7.
12	"	2 3.	"	6, 11, 8, 12, 13, 10.
13	"	4, 6.	"	8.
14	"	6.	"	9.
15	"	7, 8.		
16	"	8, 9.	"	9.
17	"	9.	"	9.
18	"	9.	"	9.
19	"	10.	"	13, 18.
20	"	10.	"	18, 19.
21	"	11, 12.	"	19, 20, 21.
22	"	12.	"	20, 10.
23	"	12.	"	20, 21.
24	"	13.	"	21.
26	"	14.	"	22, 24.
27	"	15.	"	23.
28	"	16.	"	24.

APPENDIX IV.

THE NICENE CREED (325 A. D.)

“ We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, the maker of heaven and earth, and of all things, visible and invisible ; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God begotten not made being of one substance with the Father ; by whom all things were made, who for the sake of us men and for our salvation came down from the heavens ; was made flesh, and became man by the Holy Spirit of the Virgin Mary ; that he was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, suffered and was buried, and rose again the third day according to the Scriptures, and ascended into the heavens, and sits at the right hand of the Father, is coming again with glory to judge the living and dead ; and we believe also in the Holy Spirit.”

ERRATA

PAGE	LINE	FOR	READ
3	8	defied	deified
3	31	at	as
5	9	Irenaeus	Irenaeus
9	4	origin	Origen
9	11	Hippdyters	Hippolytus
18	29	omit not	
19	30	beliefs	belief
22	34	he	who
24	10	Mathew	Matthew
„	15	instrument	instruments
43	14	god	God
48	5	sheen	sheep
56	18	whoreas	whereas
57	27	this	the
60	33	tho	the
64	18	come	came
75	26-28	put = between	Mat and Mark
81	5	Nation	Nations
82	11	befallen	befall
84	6	sap	sop
„	22	words	the words
85	28-30	omit from	His to them
90	27	21 Mat.	21 Mat. 19
„	33	21-23	21-22
93	7	put comma after before	
94	16	empress	emperor
98	20	Chriatian	Christ in
101	1	yoga	yogi
	14	put a before mad	

101	19	senses	seances
120	23	Jaseph	Josephus
126	12	after law add are	
126	30	Add after "the evi- dence of" the words things not seen This definition is very vague Many.	
138	11	These	They
140	29	swedenburg	Swedenbong
145	16	Christian	Christians
148	4	people	peoples
"	15	After and add and beginning with.	
149	20	municipality	municipal
150	23	Mercus	Marcus
153	4	to	for
158	18	Maxico	Mexico ¹
160	23	put to after so	
"	33	Belford	Belfort
163	17	Gurdians	Guardians
"	23	for	of
168	33	christ	Christ
169	10, 11	christ	Christ
"	20, 26	christian	Christian
174	18	Anteochus	Antiochus
"	20	Epiras	Epirus
175	25	or	of
"	28	sometimes	sometime
178	18	Gentile	Gentiles
185	9	put comma after	hymn
185	17	heards	herds
187	25	contended	contented
204	9	dammed	damn

205	12	31-31	31-32
210	2	Mt.	Mk.
210	18	Jesus	Jews
211	7-8	2 Thess 2. 2	2 (2 Thess)
211	last	2, Tim 2. 10	2 (2 Tim)
212	29	4 Mt.	8 Mt.
214	5	call'd	cull'd
214	22	omit who	
216	26	revision	remission
218	18	2 Tim 2. 8	2 (2 Tim) 8
221	11	56	36
221	23	32-29	32-39

